

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

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

**COMPLETION DATE: 11/06/2025**

**PAGE# 1 of 2**

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

**CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: CUO**

**FINDING: IE**

**FINDINGS OF FACT:** The complainant filed a sexual assault case that was assigned to the named officer who she believed was not professional and emotionally empathetic in addition to questioning the use of a victim advocate during the scheduling of an appointment.

DGO 2.01 Rule 7. Respectfulness -requires officers to be professional, respectful and courteous towards others and are expected to act in a manner that cultivates and maintains a healthy and productive environment.

The named officer believed he was professional and empathetic during his contacts with the complainant via the telephone. He denied questioning the complainant's use of a victim advocate and stated he has worked with advocates in the past. The named officer did not record the conversations, so there was no independent evidence of his words or his tone. The interview that was recorded reflected that the named officer acted professionally.

The complainant did not provide the emails she sent her advocate where she claimed to have documented the comments the named officer made that made her feel that he was not empathetic and questioned the advocate's presence for an appointment.

The advocate was not available for an interview as she no longer worked at the agency.

There is insufficient evidence to prove or disprove that the named officer made insensitive and/or inappropriate comments to the complainant.

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

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

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

**COMPLETION DATE: 11/06/2025**

**PAGE# 2 of 2**

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

**CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: ND**

**FINDING: PC**

**FINDINGS OF FACT:** The complainant believed the named officer was not thoroughly investigating her case based on the terminology he used when communicating with her via telephone and did not understand why he did not accept her clothing as evidence. The complainant believed that the use of a pretext call was not the most viable option in this situation.

SFPD Unit Order 17-06 Responsibilities of Investigators and Lieutenants with respect to case management and case file review in pertinent part requires investigators to investigate thoroughly, timely, and to document their investigative steps.

The named officer stated he thoroughly investigated the complainant's case and has investigated numerous sexual assault cases. He explained that it is common practice that when evidence is scarce a pre-text call is one technique they often use in these cases.

Department records showed that the named officer documented and thoroughly investigated this case.

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: 11/25/2025**

**PAGE# 1 of 3**

**SUMMARY OF ALLEGATIONS #1-#3:** The officers failed to follow pursuit policy.

**CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: ND**

**FINDING: NF**

**FINDINGS OF FACT:** The complainants, who were uninvolved third parties, reported witnessing a high-speed police chase. They alleged that they did not hear sirens until after the police passed their vehicle and estimated that the police and the pursued vehicle were traveling no less than 60 mph. The complainants reported that the pursued vehicle and the police vehicle were both weaving into oncoming traffic before they lost sight of the vehicles. They later learned the police pursuit ended in a vehicle collision. Based on the outcome of the pursuit, they questioned whether the involved officers considered public safety and whether other resources could have been deployed to avoid the collision.

The evidence showed that officers were sent to an area where a stolen vehicle had been seen. Several units attempted to locate the vehicle but were initially unsuccessful. Seconds after Officer #1 cancelled the search and advised units to return to their areas. Another unit located the vehicle and broadcast its position. Once officers were in place and no longer in a densely populated area, they attempted a traffic stop by activating their lights and sirens. The driver of the suspected stolen vehicle deliberately fled, refusing to yield to police vehicles.

Officers pursued the fleeing vehicle for approximately seven miles over a period of about six minutes. During the pursuit, Officer #1 and his team maintained constant communication with Dispatch. Approximately three minutes into the pursuit, Officer #1 reported that one of the suspect vehicle's front tires was damaged. CAD records confirmed that he requested that the California Highway Patrol be notified and that any available units with spike strips respond. Other pursuing units consistently reported their speed, location, traffic conditions, and the presence or absence of pedestrians. The pursuit ended when the suspect driver lost control and collided with another vehicle. The impact caused the suspect car to strike a metal pole, a parked car, and ultimately a parklet where it came to rest.

The incident report and body-worn camera footage corroborate the sequence of events—from the attempted traffic stop to the resulting collision. Additionally, drones were deployed, but given the short duration of the pursuit, the incident concluded before they could assist with the pursuit.

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

**COMPLAINT DATE: 02/10/2025**

**COMPLETION DATE: 11/25/2025**

**PAGE# 2 of 3**

Officer #1, the initial pursuit supervisor, denied the complainants' allegations during his interview. He stated that he continuously monitored conditions throughout the pursuit. He also noted that another supervisor, who was not participating in the pursuit, later assumed the role of pursuit supervisor. This was evidenced by the body-worn camera footage which confirmed that supervisor had control at the scene of the collision. Furthermore, Officer #1 described traffic as light, weather conditions as dry, and stated that the suspect vehicle—already operating on a flat tire—was not traveling at excessive speeds. He further stated that once the pursuit entered the Mission District, he was preparing to terminate it, but the collision occurred before he had the opportunity.

Department General Order (DGO) 5.05, *Emergency Response and Pursuit Driving*, establishes the policies and procedures for the operation of police vehicles in both emergency response and pursuit driving situations. Specifically, Department General Order (DGO) 5.05.02.C.1 states the following;

**C. Pursuit Policy**

- 1. The policy of the San Francisco Police Department is to safely apprehend a fleeing violator without unnecessarily endangering the public and/or peace officers.
- 2. Pursuant to California Vehicle Code 17004.7, in determining whether to continue a vehicle pursuit, members shall balance the known or reasonably suspected offense and the apparent need for immediate capture against the risks to motorists, pedestrians, officers and others to protect the public. When it becomes apparent that the benefits of immediate apprehension are clearly outweighed by an unreasonable danger to the peace officer or others, the member shall terminate the pursuit.
- 3. Pursuant to 17004 and 17004.7(c)(4), it is the policy of the Department that field supervisors (Patrol Sergeants) continually monitor, evaluate, and control subordinates' vehicle pursuits. Supervisors shall continuously evaluate the need for the pursuit against the risk to safety of persons and property. When the risks appear to be unreasonable, the supervisors shall immediately order the pursuit terminated.

The evidence demonstrated that officers and supervisors made ongoing assessments consistent with DGO 5.05. They attempted the traffic stop under conditions that minimized risk (non-dense area, lights and sirens activated). Once the suspect fled, officers maintained constant communication with Dispatch and reported conditions that are directly relevant to the risk-benefit analysis required under the policy.

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

**COMPLAINT DATE: 02/10/2025**

**COMPLETION DATE: 11/25/2025**

**PAGE# 3 of 3**

Officer #1 proactively sought additional resources and coordinated with other units, indicating ongoing supervision. Traffic and environmental conditions were favorable, and there is no evidence the officers escalated the risk by driving at excessive speeds or failing to communicate situational changes. Supervisory oversight was continuous, including the transition to another patrol supervisor. The pursuit was of relatively short duration and ended because of the suspect's actions, not a tactical choice by the officers. Although Officer #1 considered terminating the pursuit as the environment became more complex, the collision occurred before such action could be taken. Based on the available evidence and the requirements of DGO 5.05, the officers' actions—including the pursuit supervisor's monitoring and evaluation—appear consistent with Department policy. The pursuit involved continuous risk assessment, timely communications, and efforts to deploy additional resources. The collision was the result of the suspect's loss of control rather than any identifiable failure to follow pursuit policy.

The evidence proves that the conduct alleged did not occur.

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

**COMPLAINT DATE: 03/16/2025**

**COMPLETION DATE: 11/13/25**

**PAGE# 1 of 5**

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

**CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: ND**

**FINDING: U**

**FINDINGS OF FACT:** The complainant stated that she went to a police station to report an incident. She spoke with the named officer, who refused to write an incident report.

The named officer denied refusing to write an incident report. He stated that he listened to the complainant's account of the incident and that it did not appear that a crime had occurred. However, he advised her to write a statement, provided blank SFPD 337G "Incident Report Statement" forms, and repeatedly emphasized that the written statement was part of the incident report. The officer then completed a full Incident Report.

Department records show that the named officer completed an Incident Report.

Body-worn camera footage shows the named officer taking the complainant's statement and prepping the Incident Report while the complainant drafted her written statement. There was some miscommunication as the complainant did not believe the officer was writing an Incident Report. The complainant requested a supervisor. The named officer brought a Sergeant to speak to the complainant, who assured the complainant that an Incident Report was being written.

The evidence proves that the conduct alleged did not occur.

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

**COMPLAINT DATE: 03/16/2025**

**COMPLETION DATE: 11/13/25**

**PAGE# 2 of 5**

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

**CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: CUO**

**FINDING: U**

**FINDINGS OF FACT:** The complainant stated that before speaking to the named officer, the officer was assisting a male individual. She heard the named officer tell the man that the man's incident was not a crime, but that the officer would take an incident report, as the man had requested. The complainant said she was not given the same option, which she found discriminatory.

The named officer denied any bias. He stated that the complainant was not privy to the full details of the man's issue.

Department records show that the named officer completed an Incident Report documenting the complainant's incident.

The evidence proves that the conduct alleged did not occur.

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

**COMPLAINT DATE: 03/16/2025**

**COMPLETION DATE: 11/13/25**

**PAGE# 3 of 5**

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

**CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: CUO**

**FINDING: PC**

**FINDINGS OF FACT:** The complainant stated that she told the named officer that she was unhappy with his decision not to complete an incident report. She told the officer she would file a complaint against him, and the officer then changed his position, denying that he had refused to take a report. The complainant believed this was inappropriate.

The named officer stated that he never told the complainant he would not complete an Incident Report. He noted that the complainant must have misheard or misinterpreted what was said to her. He reiterated that he tried several times to explain that the written statement was part of the Incident Report.

The body-worn camera (BWC) footage does not capture the initial interaction between the complainant and the officer.

The BWC shows that the named officer did not tell the complainant that he would not complete the Incident Report. In fact, the officer told the complainant he was completing the report while she was completing the written statement. He was actively asking her for details of the incident and updating the report as she was writing the statement. Later, the footage captures the complainant accusing the officer of telling her that he refused to take an Incident Report. The officer denies this, stating that he told her the incident was not a crime but that he would take an Incident Report. The footage later also captures the complainant saying that the officer asked her to file an Incident Report, and she was confused about whether the officer wanted to continue taking a report. The officer told the complainant that it was entirely up to her whether to file a report. The footage showed that the complainant seemed to misunderstand and believed the officer was not completing a report and requested a supervisor. A supervisor spoke with the complainant and assured her that a report was being written.

Although the video evidence did not capture the initial interaction between the complainant and officer, the recorded evidence does not show the officer refusing to take an Incident report. Instead, it shows the officer completing the Incident Report. The complainant is heard to claim that the officer refused to write a report, but also that the officer asked her to file a report. As such, the balance of the evidence proves that the alleged conduct occurred; however, the conduct was justified, lawful, and proper.



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

**COMPLAINT DATE: 03/16/2025**

**COMPLETION DATE: 11/13/25**

**PAGE# 4 of 5**

**SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #4:** The officer failed to initiate or process a personnel complaint.

**CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: ND**

**FINDING: PC**

**FINDINGS OF FACT:** The complainant said that she went back to the police station the next day to complain about the Incident Report officer. She spoke to a Sergeant, the named officer. The named officer failed to open a complaint and instead tried to persuade her to pursue an internal “station-level retraining” rather than filing a formal complaint. The complainant said that the named officer did not assist her or provide her with the option to file a complaint.

The named officer stated he spoke with the complainant by phone and listened to her concerns. He said that several times during their conversation, the complainant heard his words, removed some words, and repeated a misunderstood version back to the officer. This happened several times, and when the officer clarified, the complainant would continue with her changed version. The named officer decided that the best way to establish communication was via email.

The named officer denied the allegation, stating that the complainant did not want to file a complaint with the Department of Police Accountability (DPA) or with the San Francisco Police Department (SFPD). He explained her right to do so but stated that the complainant was only interested in informal retraining.

The emails between the named officer and the complainant were obtained. In the emails, the named officer explained that the complainant could file a complaint directly with the DPA, have a supervisor assist her in filing a complaint with the DPA, or have the named officer facilitate a retraining session with the officer. The emails indicate that the complainant initially wanted a retraining session, rather than a formal complaint. The emails show that later, the complainant became confused about whether the correct procedure for filing a DPA complaint was for her to file it directly or for the named officer to file it on her behalf. The emails show that the named officer is trying to support the complainant's decision.

The evidence shows that the named officer did not initiate a formal personnel complaint. However, based on the email evidence, the complainant never requested to use the formal complaint procedure with the named officer. Instead, the complainant initially sought an informal process but later changed her mind after the named officer provided her with all available options. The evidence proves that the alleged conduct occurred; however, the conduct was justified, lawful, and proper.

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

**COMPLAINT DATE: 03/16/2025**

**COMPLETION DATE: 11/13/25**

**PAGE# 5 of 5**

**SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #5:** The officer failed to comply with Department General Order 2.04. Complaints Against Officers.

**CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: ND**

**FINDING: PC**

**FINDINGS OF FACT:** The complainant stated that the named officer told her he wanted to speak to the officer in question before assisting her. The complainant opined that this was against SFPD policy. She also stated that he could not help her file a complaint with the DPA and that she had to do so herself. She noted that this was also against SFPD policy.

The named officer denied the allegation. The named officer stated that he listened to the complainant's issue, told her he would review the report and the video evidence, and would contact her as soon as possible to resolve her issues. He said he could not recall telling her he wanted to speak to the officer in question. The named officer pointed out that this officer worked swing shifts and was not on duty at the time of the initial phone call with the complainant.

Email evidence shows that the named officer explained all available options to the complainant, who initially sought informal retraining before deciding to file a formal complaint herself. In the email, the named officer explicitly states that a supervisor can assist her in completing a complaint to the DPA.

Department records show that the officer the complainant was speaking to the named officer about was not on duty at the time of the initial phone call.

Department General Order 2.04, Complaints Against Officers, states that a complainant may personally complete a complaint form or have an officer prepare it for them.

The email evidence shows that the named officer did provide both options 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: 03/26/2025**

**COMPLETION DATE: 11/13/2025**

**PAGE# 1 of 7**

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

**CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: ND**

**FINDING: IE**

**FINDINGS OF FACT:** The complainant reported that her ex-husband violated a restraining order and that the named officer failed to properly investigate the incident as she never spoke to the restrained party or conducted much of an investigation at all. The complainant was confused as to how she responded to the scene and quickly decided that the restraining order had not been violated without conducting further investigation.

The evidence, such as statements, police reports, body-worn camera footage, and officer statements showed the following: on the date in question, the complainant had a validly served and executed restraining order against her ex-husband (the restrained party) in protection of her and her children (the protected parties). She and her children went to worship. The complainant alleged the restrained party knowingly entered the place of worship, made eye contact with her, proceeded inside, and sat just a few rows away from her, in violation of the order. In fear, she quickly left with her two children. The complainant called the police, and the above-named officer was assigned to her call. Before responding to the scene, the named officer utilized her Department-issued cellphone to call the complainant and gain preliminary evidence, such as party names, details of the restraining order, and what had occurred. The complainant alleged that she informed the named officer of the above facts.

The named officer electronically reviewed the restraining order prior to responding to the complainant's home and confirmed that an order was in place against her ex-husband and that he was required to stay at least 100 yards away from the protected parties. The named officer stated that the complainant only informed her that she observed her ex-husband enter the place of worship and she quickly left without further contact. The named officer did not believe the facts presented to her amounted to a violation of the restraining order and consulted with a sergeant who agreed. The named officer and her partner arrived on-scene and informed the complainant of such. The named officer did not generate a report but provided her with a Computer Aided Dispatch (CAD) number and left the scene. The named officer confirmed that she had not spoken to the restrained party because he was not present and she did not feel he violated the order.

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

**COMPLAINT DATE: 03/26/2025**

**COMPLETION DATE: 11/13/2025**

**PAGE# 2 of 7**

The named officer did not activate her body-worn camera while she was on the phone with the complainant. Thus, DPA was unable to independently ascertain what was said to the named officer and whether a subsequent duty existed for further investigation into the incident.

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

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

**COMPLAINT DATE: 03/26/2025**

**COMPLETION DATE: 11/13/2025**

**PAGE# 3 of 7**

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

**CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: CUO**

**FINDING: U**

**FINDINGS OF FACT:** The complainant stated that the named officer commented to her that her ex-husband could have converted to her religion as a justification to why he was at the place of worship.

The named officer denied making such comments to the complainant or otherwise acting inappropriately at any point throughout the incident.

Body-worn camera footage (BWC) of the incident did not reflect that the named officer commented that the restrained party could have converted to the complainant's religion. The footage showed the officer trying to reason with the complainant and pointing out that the place of worship is a busy public place to show the potential lack of intentionality behind his presence.

The evidence shows that the named officer did not make the comment alleged in the complaint.

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

**COMPLAINT DATE: 03/26/2025**

**COMPLETION DATE: 11/13/2025**

**PAGE# 4 of 7**

**SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #3:** The officer failed to make an arrest.

**CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: ND**

**FINDING: TF**

**FINDINGS OF FACT:** The complainant also believed that the named officer should have arrested her ex-husband for violating the restraining order. The complainant did not understand why the named officer emphasized a need for her to update the order to include specific locations.

The named officer explained that she did not arrest the restrained party because based on the facts presented to her by the complainant, she did not believe that a restraining order violation occurred. Again, she emphasized that the complainant had merely informed her that the complainant observed the restrained party enter the place of worship and she quickly left without any further interaction or contact. Had the complainant informed the officer that the ex-husband knowingly had gone there because he knew they were there, made eye contact with her, and then rather than exit the location, sat just rows away from her, the named officer would have likely generated a report and initiated an arrest.

Court records confirm that the complainant and her children are protected parties from her ex-husband. However, the named officer did not activate her body-worn camera while she was on the phone with the complainant. Thus, the preliminary conversation between the two was not recorded. Therefore, DPA cannot determine what information the complainant gave to the officer.

Throughout DPA's investigation into the matter, it became apparent to DPA that officers may not have been sufficiently trained on the various types of restraining orders and common calls for service, particularly with respect to restraining orders involving shared residencies and common areas, as well as encounters in neutral or public places. The responding officers were also unaware of Department Manuals regarding restraining orders that are highly instructive.

DPA recommends that the Department further train their officers in accordance with the above and provide examples and guidance to the officers for when they respond to these common types of calls for services. The evidence proves that the alleged conduct resulted from inadequate or inappropriate training.

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

**COMPLAINT DATE: 03/26/2025**

**COMPLETION DATE: 11/13/2025**

**PAGE# 5 of 7**

**SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #4:** The officer failed to write an incident report.

**CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: ND**

**FINDING: IE**

**FINDINGS OF FACT:** The complainant alleged that the named officer should have generated an incident report reflecting the occurrence. A few weeks after the incident, the complainant responded to the station and a witness officer generated a report and declared it a violation of a restraining order. The complainant's statement to the witness officer was consistent with the statement made to DPA. However, as elaborated above, the named officer on the date of incident did not generate a report because she did not believe a crime had been committed based upon the information the complainant gave her at the time.

With respect to Domestic Violence Calls for services, Department policy only requires officers to note their response in a Computer Aided Dispatch Report (CAD) when crimes do not occur. Here, the named officer did that. However, because DPA is unable to ascertain by a preponderance of the evidence what the complainant told the officers regarding the incident, DPA is unable to determine whether the named officer was required to generate an incident report or simply note the response in the CAD.

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

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

**COMPLAINT DATE: 03/26/2025**

**COMPLETION DATE: 11/13/2025**

**PAGE# 6 of 7**

**SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #5:** Policy or procedure complaint.

**CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: P/P**

**FINDING: PF**

**FINDINGS OF FACT:** The above facts are hereby incorporated by reference.

As explained above, DPA's investigation revealed that a need exists for the Department to update its policies to require officers to activate their body-worn cameras or otherwise record the conversation when officers are conducting preliminary investigations on the phone with reportees. DPA suggests that it is particularly necessary for calls for services regarding domestic violence and restraining orders. DPA encourages officers to remain proactive and efficient, as the named officer did here when she called the complainant to gather pertinent information while en route. However, as mentioned, the failure to record the conversation prevented DPA from coming to a finding by a preponderance of the evidence on several of the allegations posed by the complainant. This is particularly important and relevant here, as the named officer admitted that had the complainant told her what she relayed to DPA, she would have investigated the incident differently, generated an incident report, and could have arrested the complainant. Additionally, having a recording of such conversations would also be useful in other aspects of law enforcement, such as in arrests and court proceedings.

DPA recommends that the policies and procedures be changed or modified in accordance with the above.



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

**COMPLAINT DATE: 03/26/2025**

**COMPLETION DATE: 11/13/2025**

**PAGE# 7 of 7**

**SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #6:** The officer failed to generate an incident report.

**CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: ND**

**FINDING: NF**

**FINDINGS OF FACT:** The complaint alleged that a few days after the occurrence, she went to the station to try and generate a report. However, the person who she spoke with at the front desk informed her they could not take a report because the officers on-scene had already determined there was no crime. The complainant could not identify the person she spoke to or describe what they looked like with certainty.

Since the complainant could not identify the specific officer or individual involved in the above interaction, DPA sent an Identification Poll (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 into this allegation.

Also, DPA was unable to locate other Department records of this interaction.

No findings occur when an officer cannot reasonably be identified.

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

**COMPLAINT DATE: 04/07/2025**

**COMPLETION DATE: 11/13/2025**

**PAGE# 1 of 5**

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

**CATEGORY OF CONDUCT:  
CUO**

**FINDING: IE**

**FINDINGS OF FACT:** The complainant resided in two-unit building and experienced on-going issues with her neighbors occupying the other unit. The neighbors had obtained a restraining order against the complainant, which prohibited her from harassing them. On the date in question, the neighbors called the police alleging that the complainant had harassed them by parking her vehicle in a manner preventing them from being able to back their vehicle out of the shared garage. The complainant alleged the named officer responded to the scene and was unnecessarily rude and aggressive towards her throughout the incident.

The named officer did not believe he was rude or aggressive towards the complainant and maintained that his demeanor was calm. The named officer, however, pointed out the complainant's demeanor and described her as irrational, and unwilling to listen to reason, consistent with the officer's past interactions with her.

The evidence, such as body-worn camera footage, and photographs of the shared garage, showed that the complainant parked her vehicle in a manner which prevented the neighbors from exiting the garage. The footage also showed that the named officer became increasingly impatient with the complainant when he tried to explain to her that she could not park her vehicle in such a way and pointed out the ample amount of space she had to pull forward as to not block them inside the garage. The complainant continued to push back against the officer's assertions regarding the occurrence and the named officer became evidently frustrated with the complainant. The evidence, however, did not show that the named officer was overly rude or aggressive.

Department policy requires officers to maintain professionalism, respect and courtesy in the course of their duties. The officer here could have been more patient with the complainant. However, the officer maintained a certain level of professionalism and given the totality of the circumstances, the named officer's conduct did not rise to the level of misconduct.

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

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

**COMPLAINT DATE: 04/07/2025**

**COMPLETION DATE: 11/13/2025**

**PAGE# 2 of 5**

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

**CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: UA**

**FINDING: PC**

**FINDINGS OF FACT:** The complainant also alleged that the named officer arrested her for violating the restraining order without cause. The complainant stated that the named officer asked her to move her vehicle forward. She complied but did not pull it all the way forward, to the officers “liking.” She believed that the officer made an arbitrary decision to arrest her rather than letting her move the vehicle forward further.

The named officer confirmed that he arrested the complainant for violating a validly served and executed restraining order. He felt the evidence showed that she intentionally parked her vehicle in a manner which prohibited the protected parties from exiting the garage. He based this decision, in part, because when the neighbors had asked her to move the vehicle forward so they could leave, she refused, showing the intentionality behind her actions. Additionally, when the officers asked her to move the vehicle, she did not readily comply. Her attitude and behavior in failing to move the vehicle up all the way did not factor into his decision to arrest her. The named officer explained that the violation of the order had already been made when she parked her car in such a manner. The demand for her to move her vehicle, he explained, was simply to allow the neighbors to exit the garage and not an opportunity to evade the impending arrest.

DPA understands that the complainant may have been confused by the officer’s decision to arrest her after she attempted to move the vehicle, however, the footage made it apparent that the named officer’s intention had been to arrest the complainant regardless of whether she moved the vehicle. Additionally, the evidence supported the named officer’s decision to arrest the complainant for violating the restraining order.

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

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

**COMPLAINT DATE: 04/07/2025**

**COMPLETION DATE: 11/13/2025**

**PAGE# 3 of 5**

**SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #3: The officer improperly touched an adult in a sexual manner.**

**CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: CUO**

**FINDING: IE**

**FINDINGS OF FACT:** The complainant alleged that the named officer conducted an inappropriate search on the complainant outside the county jail. She stated that while conducting said search, he touched her inappropriately.

The named officer could not recall whether he conducted the search incident to a lawful arrest of the complainant outside the jail on said date. However, he opined that had he searched the complainant, he would have followed Department policy and most definitely would not have touched her improperly or exceeded the scope of the search.

The officer's BWC - consistent with Department policy - was not activated when outside the county jail. Additionally, the complainant filed the complaint several years after the incident and any potential surveillance footage no longer existed. Thus, DPA is unable to make a finding as to the allegation as independent evidence of the search in question does not exist.

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

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

**COMPLAINT DATE: 04/07/2025**

**COMPLETION DATE: 11/13/2025**

**PAGE# 4 of 5**

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

**CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: CUO**

**FINDING: IE**

**FINDINGS OF FACT:** The complainant also stated that the officer inappropriately made her sit outside the jail in rigid temperatures and refused to allow her to sit under a nearby heater.

The named officer could not recall whether this occurred nor was he aware of any areas outside the county jail with heaters where custodies are authorized to sit. If there was such an area, he believed that he would have allowed an individual to sit there upon request versus torture them in the cold.

As mentioned above, consistent with Department policy, the officer's BWC was not activated outside the county jail and surveillance footage of the incident outside the jail does not exist. Thus, DPA is unable to make a finding as to the allegation no independent evidence of such exists.

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

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

**COMPLAINT DATE: 04/07/2025**

**COMPLETION DATE: 11/13/2025**

**PAGE# 5 of 5**

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

**CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: UF**

**FINDING: PC**

**FINDINGS OF FACT:** The complainant alleged that the named officer handcuffed her too tightly, causing her bruises.

The named officer did not recall handcuffing her improperly or otherwise too tightly. He emphasized that the complainant had very small wrists and unless she was moving or trying to evade the handcuffs, there was no way he could have injured her by simply applying the handcuffs. It is also states his procedure to check for proper degree of tightness when someone expresses a concern.

Consistent with the officer's statement, the BWC footage showed that when the officers placed handcuffs on her, the named officer commented on how small her wrists were. Additionally, the footage showed that when she complained that the handcuffs were hurting her, he instructed her to stop jerking and checked her cuffs for proper degree of tightness.

Additionally, DPA was not provided with any evidence of bruising due to the placement of the handcuffs.

DPA understands that handcuffs themselves are often not comfortable and can often hurt. The video footage supported that the named officer administered the handcuffs properly and checked for proper degree of tightness when she aired her concern.

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

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

**COMPLAINT DATE: 05/14/2025      COMPLETION DATE: 11/25/25      PAGE# 1 of 1**

**SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #1:** The officer improperly or unsafely used Department or City equipment.

**CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: ND**

**FINDING: NF**

**FINDINGS OF FACT:** The complainant stated in the online complaint that an officer parked in the red zone and blocked the Light Rail Vehicle (LRV).

The complainant provided a photograph of the vehicle; however, 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.

Department Records do not clearly indicate which officer was assigned to the unit at the time of the incident.

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: 05/28/2025**

**COMPLETION DATE: 11/25/2025**

**PAGE# 1 of 2**

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

**CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: CUO**

**FINDING: IC(S)**

**FINDINGS OF FACT:** The complainant lodged a complaint about the named officer's behavior during a traffic stop. The complainant stated that on the date in question, he and two other individuals were riding their electric bicycles (e-bikes) when they inadvertently ran a stop sign. The named officer activated his patrol lights and attempted to effectuate a traffic stop. The complainant stated he was looking for a safe place to pull over when the named officer pulled up behind him and threatened to run them over. Thereafter, the complainant stated the named officer made insulting comments about his fitness as a father.

The evidence, such as video footage including body-worn camera footage, and statements made by the complainant and officer confirmed that the named officer made inappropriate comments throughout the incident.

The named officer admitted that he ordered them to "stop," or that he would run them over. The named officer emphasized that he believed the complainant was attempting to evade his lawful orders and that he utilized the statement to try spook him into compliance. The named officer did not intend to "threaten," him, and explained that often officers will use a tactic, such as the one here, to gain compliance without having to resort to force.

The named officer also admitted to making sarcastic comments to the complainant. Short of acknowledging his comment was inappropriate, the named officer stated that if he offended the complainant, then perhaps it was not the best tone of voice to use. The named officer maintained that he had not intended to insult him.

Department General Order 2.01, General Rules of Conduct, (DGO 2.01) requires its officers to maintain the highest level of professional conduct and to treat the public with courtesy and respect and not directly discourteous language at members of the public.

The named officer's conduct violated Department policy as his behavior was not courteous, or professional and the situation did not warrant such behavior.



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

**COMPLAINT DATE: 05/28/2025      COMPLETION DATE: 11/25/2025      PAGE# 2 of 2**

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

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

**COMPLAINT DATE: 06/01/2025      COMPLETION DATE: 11/13/25      PAGE# 1 of 2**

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

**CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: ND**

**FINDING: PC**

**FINDINGS OF FACT:** The complainant stated that the named officer closed the case on the word of her ex-husband. The complainant further stated that the named officer did not contact her for any additional information or witness contact.

The named officer stated that he conducted a full investigation, in which the complainant alleged that she was being stalked. The named officer said that he did not know who the complainant's "ex" was and never interviewed him. He said that he interviewed all parties and obtained all necessary contact information from department records.

Department Records corroborated the statements that were provided by the named officer.

The evidence showed that the named officer took appropriate investigative steps.

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: 06/01/2025      COMPLETION DATE: 11/13/25      PAGE# 2 of 2**

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

**CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: ND**

**FINDING: PC**

**FINDINGS OF FACT:** The complainant stated that the named officer mentioned that she was on a television show, but it had nothing to do with her being stalked. The complainant said she told the named officer that it was entertainment, and now she sees why people say that the San Francisco Police Department (SFPD) is inept.

The named officer stated that he contacted the complainant twice about her case. He acknowledged that he explained why he didn't find her allegations to be credible and that he would be inactivating the case. The named officer said that the complainant said, *"We are all scratching our heads why San Francisco PD is inept at this point."* He then said that he told her that he was giving her information, and he didn't have to hear her insults about his department. The named officer said that he then hung up. The named officer stated that he disagreed with all the allegations that were presented by the complainant. He utilized professionalism and patience with each contact that was made.

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

The 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: 06/02/2025      COMPLETION DATE: 11/13/25      PAGE# 1 of 1**

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

**CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: ND**

**FINDING: PC**

**FINDINGS OF FACT:** The complainant stated he was arrested for no apparent reason.

The incident report (IR) showed that the complainant was arrested for making criminal threats, disturbing the peace and public nuisance. The IR noted that the complainant is a known subject who has had numerous police contacts at the location where he was arrested. The complainant is known to threaten officers and members of the public.

The named officer's body-worn camera (BWC) captured the complainant's behavior, supporting the named officer's arrest.

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

**CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: CUO**

**FINDING: U**

**FINDINGS OF FACT:** The complainant alleged that the named officer told the complainant's friend that what the complainant had told his friend about never being convicted was a lie.

The named officer BWC did not support the complainant's allegation.

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

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

**COMPLAINT DATE: 06/11/2025      COMPLETION DATE: 11/05/25      PAGE# 1 of 2**

**SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #1:** The officer failed to display his or her name or star number.

**CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: ND**

**FINDING: PC**

**FINDINGS OF FACT:** The complainant stated that the named officer removed his name tag to hide his name from members of the public.

The named officer stated that his name tag fell off while moving protestors back while conducting crowd control. The named officer stated that he informed a supervisor about his name tag falling off.

Body-worn camera (“BWC”) footage showed that the named officer approached a supervisor and informed him that his name tag hand fell off.

The evidence showed that this was an equipment malfunction and that the named officer followed procedure by informing a supervisor.

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: 06/11/2025      COMPLETION DATE: 11/05/25      PAGE# 2 of 2**

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

**CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: UF**

**FINDING: U**

**FINDINGS OF FACT:** The complainant stated that the named officer used a baton to strike multiple people without cause.

The named officer denied using his baton on anyone and denied using excessive force.

There is no documentation of any force being used by the named officer.

There is no BWC footage of any force being used by the named officer.

There are no other witnesses of force being used by the named officer.

The evidence proved that the misconduct alleged in the complaint did not occur.

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

**COMPLAINT DATE: 06/12/2025**

**COMPLETION DATE: 11/06/2025**

**PAGE# 1 of 4**

**SUMMARY OF ALLEGATIONS #1-2:** The officers failed to write an incident report.

**CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: ND**

**FINDING: PC**

**FINDINGS OF FACT:** The complainant and his partner (co-complainant) lodged a complaint against the named officers regarding a call for service in which the housing management where they reside failed to provide the co-complainant with keys to the unit as his name was allegedly not on the lease. Per the housing's policies, an individual that is not on the lease must check in at the desk and be accompanied by the tenant to gain access to the premises. The complainant felt that the refusal to provide him the keys amounted to harassment and a violation of the American with Disabilities Act as the complainant was physically handicapped and could not easily get around. The complainant felt that the officers should have generated an incident report.

The named officers recalled responding to the call for service. The named officers are familiar with the premises and the housing where the complainants reside. The officers explained that the housing has a strict guest policy and as mentioned by the complainant, requires tenants to accompany non-residents into the building. The named officers consulted with the receptionist who informed them that the co-complainant was not issued a key fob because his name was not on the lease. Named officer #1 provided the complainants with a manager who they could contact to explain the justifications further.

The named officers confirmed that they had not generated an incident report reflecting the call because a crime had not occurred. They explained that the facts presented by the complainant did not amount to a criminal crime of harassment or abuse that could be investigated and that violations of the American with Disabilities Act is outside their purview as officers. Moreover, who the housing development issues its key fobs to and how are issues outside the purview of SFPD's jurisdiction. The Police Department has no control over this and there was nothing further they could do as police officers.

The evidence, such as the officers' body-worn camera footage, reflects that a crime had not been reported to the officers and that the officers are correct in their assertion that potential ADA violations and who the housing development chooses to issue keys to are outside their jurisdiction as officers. Thus, officers were not required to generate a police report. The officers, however, did generate a detailed Computer Aided Dispatch (CAD) report regarding the incident. They also captured the entire interaction on body-worn camera.

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

**COMPLAINT DATE: 06/12/2025**

**COMPLETION DATE: 11/06/2025**

**PAGE# 2 of 4**

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 he requested to speak with a Sergeant. However, the officers failed to promptly contact one.

The body-worn camera footage of the incident reflected that towards the end of the incident, the co-complainant became increasingly dissatisfied with the named officers' response to their concerns. The co-complainant requested for the officers' leave their home and have their on-duty sergeant call him. The named officer attested that per his request, a Sergeant contacted the complainant after they left the scene.

Department policy does not require officers to immediately contact a Sergeant upon an individual's request. Any delay in calling the Sergeant in this instance was reasonable and within policy, particularly since the co-complainant's request for a sergeant was immediately followed by a demand for the officers to leave their home.

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



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

**COMPLAINT DATE: 06/12/2025**

**COMPLETION DATE: 11/06/2025**

**PAGE# 3 of 4**

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

**CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: CUO**

**FINDING: U**

**FINDINGS OF FACT:** The complainant alleged that the officers were dismissive when he asked them how he could file a complaint against the SFPD dispatchers.

Both named officers denied being dismissive towards the complainant or otherwise acting inappropriately at any point during the incident. After the officers left the unit, the co-complainant stood in the doorway and said that dispatchers made fun of him and the call. However, during their interactions, neither the complainant nor the co-complainant asked them questions regarding dispatchers or how to file a complaint against them.

The body-worn camera footage corroborated the officers' statements they were neither rude nor dismissive towards the complainants and that the complainant never asked them how to file a complaint against dispatchers during their interactions. The footage showed that as the officers left the unit per his request, the co-complainant mentioned that a dispatcher made fun of him and nothing further.

The evidence proves that the conduct alleged did not occur.

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

**COMPLAINT DATE: 06/12/2025**

**COMPLETION DATE: 11/06/2025**

**PAGE# 4 of 4**

**SUMMARY OF ALLEGATIONS #7-8:** The officers failed to maintain required knowledge.

**CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: ND**

**FINDING: U**

**FINDINGS OF FACT:** The complainant alleged that the officers were unfamiliar with how to process an Adult Protective Services (APS) complaint or report.

The named officers demonstrated sufficient knowledge of how to process an APS complaint or report in their response to DPA's investigation. Both officers have utilized APS in their line of work over the years. Here, however, the named officers explained that APS is not responsible for ensuring that the co-complainant had a key to the premises and no facts presented to the officers warranted a mandatory reporting to APS.

The evidence, such as the officers' body-worn camera footage, did not reflect that the officers were unfamiliar with how to process an APS complaint or report. The officers appeared knowledgeable throughout the incident. The evidence also did not require the officers to file a mandatory report with APS.

The evidence proves that the conduct alleged did not occur.

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

**COMPLAINT DATE: 06/16/2025      COMPLETION DATE: 11/14/2025      PAGE# 1 of 2**

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

**CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: UA**

**FINDING: PC**

**FINDINGS OF FACT:** The complainant and her partner had an argument while out on the street. Someone saw them and called 911 for assistance. The complainant said the responding officers placed her partner in handcuffs and arrested him because, according to the caller, her partner had punched and choked her. The complainant said none of it happened and believed the arrest was unlawful.

The named officer said she arrested the complainant's partner for domestic violence based on the statement of a witness who observed him pushing the complainant and wrapping his hands around her neck, briefly strangling her. The officer stated the complainant had visible red marks on both sides of her neck.

The incident report associated with the incident indicated that the caller was awakened by the loud voices outside and saw the partner push the complainant and he had his hands around her neck. The report showed that the complainant appeared scared, the caller had positively identified the suspect, and the officers observed red marks on the complainant's neck. It further stated that the two had been dating and living together for three years and had prior domestic violence incidents.

The Department of Police Accountability (DPA) obtained the body-worn camera (BWC) videos related to the incident. The videos were consistent with the documentation in the incident report and the officer's statement to DPA.

The evidence shows the officer had probable cause to make an arrest.

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

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

**COMPLAINT DATE: 06/16/2025      COMPLETION DATE: 11/14/2025      PAGE# 1 of 2**

**SUMMARY OF ALLEGATIONS #2-3:** The officers used unnecessary or excessive force.

**CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: UF**

**FINDING: PC**

**FINDINGS OF FACT:** The complainant stated that the officers acted aggressively toward her partner, pushing him against a patrol car and pulling his hair.

Named Officer #1 denied committing these acts. He stated that, as he walked the subject to a patrol vehicle after arrest, the arrestee shifted his weight backward toward the officer multiple times to stop him from walking him to the car. Named Officer #1 stated he used control holds by holding the subject's handcuffs and his right elbow with his right hand.

Named officer #2 did not recall pushing the complainant's partner. He said he used a low level of force to physically control him while walking to the patrol car and away from the complainant. He believed the complainant would have been in danger had no physical controls been used. Named officer #2 could not recall grabbing the person's hair, but after reviewing the body-worn camera (BWC) footage of the incident, it was possible that he might have grabbed his hair. He stated that any control holds he used were to overcome the person's passive resistance and to get him away from the complainant.

DGO 5.01 allows officers to use their body parts, which include their hands, to gain control of a subject.

DPA obtained the BWC videos of the incident. Named officer #1's BWC footage shows that the complainant's partner was uncooperative and hesitant to walk, telling the officers, "You're going to have to shoot me." At some point, he yelled that somebody pulled his hair. He became angry, started yelling, and cussed at the officers. It was not clear in the footage who or if anyone grabbed his hair. The rest of the BWC video footage did not show any unnecessary or excessive force.

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

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

**COMPLAINT DATE: 06/24/2025      COMPLETION DATE: 11/25/25      PAGE# 1 of 10**

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

**CATEGORY OF CONDUCT:** UA

**FINDING:** PC

**FINDINGS OF FACT:** The complainant stated she was unlawfully detained inside the apartment of her recently deceased friend, for whom she had served as a caretaker. She acknowledged that she did not possess any legal documentation authorizing her to remain in the apartment.

The named officer stated that the complainant was lawfully detained in response to a burglary call, during which she was identified as the suspect. The officer further explained that the complainant was not authorized to be inside the apartment and was unable to provide evidence to the contrary.

Department records show that the named officer responded to a call for service regarding a possible burglary. The property manager reported that an unauthorized individual was inside the apartment of a recently deceased resident.

Body-worn camera (BWC) footage showed the property manager informing officers that someone was inside the apartment of a recently deceased resident. He explained that the decedent was the sole leaseholder, and therefore no one was authorized to be inside.

Department General Order (DGO) 5.03 (Investigative Detentions) states in the relevant part that an officer must have reasonable suspicion to lawfully detain an individual. It states, "Reasonable suspicion is a set of specific facts that would lead a reasonable person to believe that a crime, is, was, or it 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. Reasonable suspicion cannot be based solely on a hunch or instinct."

The named officer responded to a call regarding a possible burglary, whereby the complainant was found inside an apartment that she had no legal right to occupy. Based on reasonable suspicion that a crime was in progress, the named officer lawfully detained 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: 06/24/2025**

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

**PAGE# 2 of 10**

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

**CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: UA**

**FINDING: NF**

**FINDINGS OF FACT:** The complainant stated she was unlawfully detained inside the apartment of her recently deceased friend, for whom she had served as a caretaker. She acknowledged that she did not possess any legal documentation authorizing her to remain in the apartment.

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

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

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

**CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: ND**

**FINDING: PC**

**FINDINGS OF FACT:** The complainant stated the named officer refused to investigate the report of a missing cat.

The named officer stated she and other officers looked for the missing cat in the apartment while the complainant was getting a rental car. She stated the cat was never found. She also stated that the cat was not the complainant's property but belonged to recently deceased tenant.

Department records show that the named officer responded to a call for service regarding a possible burglary. The property manager reported that an unauthorized individual was inside the apartment of a recently deceased resident.

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

**COMPLAINT DATE: 06/24/2025      COMPLETION DATE: 11/25/25      PAGE# 3 of 10**

BWC footage showed that the named officer, along with other officers, made a diligent effort to locate the missing cat inside the apartment. The complainant acknowledged that the cat was not currently licensed in her name but stated that she intended to register it in the near future.

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

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

**CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: ND**

**FINDING: NF**

**FINDINGS OF FACT:** The complainant stated the named officer refused to investigate the report of a missing cat.

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

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

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

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

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

**PAGE# 4 of 10**

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

**CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: CUO**

**FINDING: PC**

**FINDINGS OF FACT:** The complainant stated the named officer initially would not agree to write a report regarding the missing cat.

The named officer stated the complainant informed her that the cat belonged to her deceased friend and was not registered in her name. The named officer stated that the cat did not belong to the complainant and therefore would not be writing a report regarding the missing cat.

Department records show that an incident report was written, which included information about the missing cat.

BWC footage showed the named officer refuse to write a report regarding the missing cat because the cat did not belong to the complainant. She informed the complainant that once she registered the cat in her name, she could file a report. While the complainant was escorted outside the building, she complained of pain from the control hold. A sergeant was subsequently called to the scene to conduct a use of force evaluation. The complainant was informed that a report would be written.

The named officer did not violate Department policy by initially refusing to write a report regarding a missing cat that did not legally belong to the complainant. The complainant did not have standing as she did not own the cat.

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



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

**COMPLAINT DATE: 06/24/2025      COMPLETION DATE: 11/25/25      PAGE# 5 of 10**

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

**CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: CUO**

**FINDING: NF**

**FINDINGS OF FACT:** The complainant stated the named officer initially would not agree to write a report regarding the missing cat.

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

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

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

**CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: UA**

**FINDING: U**

**FINDINGS OF FACT:** The complainant stated the named officer unlawfully evicted her from the apartment of her deceased friend. The complainant acknowledged that she was not on the lease or any other legal document signed by the deceased that allowed her to remain.

The named officer stated that the complainant did not have the necessary documentation to be inside the apartment.

Department records show that the named officer responded to a call for service regarding a possible burglary. The property manager reported that an unauthorized individual was inside the apartment of a recently deceased resident.

BWC footage showed that the complainant could not produce any documentation to support her presence in the apartment.

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

**COMPLAINT DATE: 06/24/2025      COMPLETION DATE: 11/25/25      PAGE# 6 of 10**

The complainant did not have legal authorization to be in the apartment, and therefore, she was not evicted. The named officer lawfully escorted the complainant out of the apartment.

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

**SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #8:** The officer engaged in unwarranted action.

**CATEGORY OF CONDUCT:** UA

**FINDING:** NF

**FINDINGS OF FACT:** The complainant stated the named officer unlawfully evicted her from the apartment of her deceased friend. The complainant acknowledged that she was not on the lease or on any legal document signed by the deceased allowing her to remain.

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

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

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

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

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

**PAGE# 7 of 10**

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

**CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: CUO**

**FINDING: U**

**FINDINGS OF FACT:** The complainant stated the named officer waited at her apartment while she rented a vehicle so she could remove her belongings from the apartment. She stated the named officer was rude when she hung up on her.

The named officer stated she did not hang up on the complainant, but the complainant hung up on her.

Department records show that the named officer responded to a call for service regarding a possible burglary. The property manager reported that an unauthorized individual was inside the apartment of a recently deceased resident.

BWC footage captured the phone call between the complainant and the named officer, as the call was on speaker phone. The footage corroborated the named officer's account, showing that it was the complainant who ended the call, not the named officer.

The evidence does not support the complainant's allegation that the named officer hung up on her; instead, it was the complainant who hung up on the officer.

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

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

**COMPLAINT DATE: 06/24/2025      COMPLETION DATE: 11/25/25      PAGE# 8 of 10**

**SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #10:** The officer used unnecessary or excessive force.

**CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: UF**

**FINDING: NF**

**FINDINGS OF FACT:** The complainant alleged that the named officer used excessive force by bending her wrist, which she stated resulted in bruising.

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

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

**SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #11:** The officer conducted an improper search or seizure.

**CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: UA**

**FINDING: NF**

**FINDINGS OF FACT:** The complainant stated she was unlawfully searched.

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

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

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

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

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

**PAGE# 9 of 10**

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

**CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: ND**

**FINDING: IC/S**

**FINDINGS OF FACT:** During its investigation, the Department of Police Accountability (DPA) discovered that the named officer, a Field Training Officer (FTO), failed to properly supervise her trainee, who was in the first week of Phase 1 of Field Training. The named officer instructed her trainee to pat search the complainant, which was not supported by articulable facts as required by Department policy.

The named officer stated she was the FTO at the time of the incident and instructed her trainee to conduct a pat search of the complainant. She stated that the pat search was lawful because the complainant was a burglary suspect, and in her experience, burglary suspects often carry tools that could be used as weapons. She stated that she routinely conducts pat searches on burglary suspects for this reason. She acknowledged that dispatch did not indicate the suspect was armed. The officer also noted that the complainant was inside a residence, where items such as knives could be accessible and potentially used as weapons. Additionally, although she did not observe any visible bulges on the complainant's clothing, she believed the puffy jacket the complainant was wearing could conceal a weapon.

A subject matter expert (SME) was interviewed regarding the role and responsibilities of an FTO. The SME stated that the FTO is responsible for teaching the trainee to follow the law and Department policies and procedures, supervising them, and doing things the right way. The SME also stated that in Phase One of training, the trainees are not expected to know anything.

San Francisco Police Department personnel records showed the trainee was in his third week of Phase One training.

Department records show that the named officer responded to a call for service regarding a possible burglary. The property manager reported that an unauthorized individual was inside the apartment of a recently deceased resident.

BWC footage showed officers responding to a call regarding a possible burglary at the apartment of a recently deceased individual. Upon arrival, officers knocked on the door and asked the complainant to step outside. When she did, both of her hands were visible, and not holding weapons. Officers placed the complainant in handcuffs. Shortly thereafter, the named officer instructed her trainee to conduct a pat search for weapons. The complainant informed officers that she did not have any weapons and questioned

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

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

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

**PAGE# 10 of 10**

the reason for the search. The trainee, who conducted the search, explained that he was searching her because he did not know who she was and believed she was unlawfully inside the apartment. The search yielded no weapons.

Department General Order 3.13 (Field Training Program) and Department Notice 24-014 (Field Training Update) state in the relevant part, “[T]he Field Training Program strives to provide trainee officers the ability to acquire. Knowledge, skills and abilities to become competent and effective police officers who are committed to Safety with Respect.”

California POST-Certified Field Training Program Guide defines the role of the FTO. It states in the relevant part that “FTOs have significant additional responsibilities over and above their law enforcement duties when assigned to train a new officer. In addition to performing in an exemplary manner, FTOs must slow their pace to review the purpose and detail of every new encounter. FTO's must guide trainees through a comprehensive curriculum that requires the blending of knowledge and skill.”

San Francisco Police Department Field Officer 40-hour Training Course defines the functions and roles of FTOs. It states that the FTO is the first in the trainee’s command. In addition, it states that an intervention by the FTO would be appropriate if the FTO observed the trainee misapplying the law or violating civil rights.

DGO 5.03 (Investigative Detentions) states in relevant part, “Members may conduct a pat search for weapons when: . . . 2. The officer has specific and articulable facts causing them to believe that the suspect is armed and dangerous. The validity of the pat search depends on the totality of the circumstances and turns on whether a reasonably prudent officer would be warranted in the belief that the officer’s safety, or that of others, was in danger. . .”

The pat search was unlawful, in violation of the Fourth Amendment and Department policy. Body-worn camera footage did not show the complainant holding any weapons upon initial contact, nor were any suspicious bulges seen on her clothing, which were not particularly baggy. The complainant was cooperative and did not make any movements to suggest she was armed with a weapon. Additionally, the initial report of a burglary did not indicate weapons were involved. Evidence does not support that the named officer had specific and articulable facts supporting the assertion that the complainant was armed and dangerous. Therefore, the named officer failed to properly supervise her trainee when she instructed her trainee to conduct a pat search. 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: 07/03/2025      COMPLETION DATE: 11/25/25      PAGE# 1 of 1**

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

**CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: CUO**

**FINDING: IE**

**FINDINGS OF FACT:** The complainant stated that the named officer made inappropriate comments several years ago and alleged that the comments caused/exacerbated his Post Traumatic Stress Disorder (PTSD).

The named officer stated that he did not recall having such a conversation with the complainant.

There is insufficient evidence to confirm or refute the complainant's or the officer's accounts. The evidence fails to prove or disprove that the alleged conduct occurred.

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

**COMPLAINT DATE: 07/15/2025**

**COMPLETION DATE: 11/04/25**

**PAGE# 1 of 2**

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

**CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: UA**

**FINDING: PC**

**FINDINGS OF FACT:** The complainant reported owning a pickup truck with a trailer that was towed due to expired registration. They later retrieved the vehicle, incurring approximately \$1,000 in towing fees. The day before filing the complaint, they parked the car on Lincoln Way with other oversized vehicles and received a yellow notice to move it within five days. The following day, an officer issued another yellow notice referencing #xxxxxxx. The complainant believes they were being harassed and singled out, noting that nearby RVs did not receive similar notices. They stated they maintain a clean area and feel unfairly targeted.

The named officer explained that their primary duty and main responsibilities include outreach to unhoused individuals, connecting them with services, and responding to community complaints about RVs or illegally parked vehicles. The officer stated they issued a 72-hour parking notice after observing signs of long-term parking and receiving a complaint. Body-worn camera (BWC) footage showed the RV parked partially on park landscaping and partially on Lincoln Way, with personal belongings on park property and no other RVs nearby. Although the RV was legally parked at that time, it remained subject to overnight oversized vehicle restrictions. No citation was issued on the date of the complaint.

Body-worn camera (BWC) footage showed the officer placing tow warning stickers on the complainant's trailer and truck, marking the tires with chalk, and speaking with the complainant and their partner. The officer explained that the warnings were issued in response to neighbor complaints. The vehicles had been repeatedly reported for expired registration, scattered items on the street and grass, and illegal parking on city property.

Computer-aided dispatch (CAD) records confirm that the complaint originated from an anonymous caller who reported an RV and a truck with a trailer that had remained stationary for several days, with generators running, items scattered, and a dog present.

San Francisco Police Department's Department Bulletin 24-126 outlines departmental policy regarding engagement with unhoused individuals and the handling of vehicle habitation complaints. The evidence proves that the alleged conduct occurred; however, the conduct was justified, lawful, and proper.



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

**COMPLAINT DATE: 07/15/2025**

**COMPLETION DATE: 11/04/25**

**PAGE# 2 of 2**

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

**CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: CUO**

**FINDING: U**

**FINDINGS OF FACT:** The complainant alleged that they were being harassed and targeted by the named officer, resulting in multiple vehicle tows and citations over the past year.

The officer denied targeting the complainant and stated that multiple independent callers have reported issues with the complainant. The officer then provided supplemental CAD(s) to substantiate his prior enforcement actions.

BWC showed that the named officer warned that Park Rangers might remove the belongings if they were not cleared by the next day and reminded the complainant (and the complainant's partner) that city park property cannot be used for storage. The complainant's partner acknowledged prior experiences of parking their vehicles (illegally) on public streets.

Department General Order 2.01, Rule 8 (Public Courtesy), requires officers to treat all members of the public with respect, patience, and courtesy, regardless of circumstances. The rule emphasizes that officers must act professionally, avoid rude or demeaning behavior, and maintain composure even in challenging or emotional situations.

The named officer explained the reasons for the 72-hour parking notice, provided clear guidance on how to comply, and warned them courteously about possible enforcement actions. His actions reflected an effort to achieve voluntary compliance through communication rather than confrontation.

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

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

**COMPLAINT DATE: 07/17/2025**

**COMPLETION DATE: 11/04/25**

**PAGE# 1 of 1**

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

**CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: ND**

**FINDING: NF**

**FINDINGS OF FACT:** The complainant reported seeing a lieutenant make an illegal left turn from the right lane without using signals, lights, or sirens, nearly causing a collision with another driver. A description was provided for the lieutenant. The complainant was confident in identifying the officer and stated that no emergency equipment was activated during the incident.

The DPA cross-referenced the district station's schedule and station logs for the reported timeframe and identified a potential officer. The lieutenant confirmed being on duty that day. The lieutenant denied the allegation and stated he was not driving in emergency mode, had no partner or witnesses, and had no reason to drive unsafely.

Department General Order 5.05 (Emergency Vehicle Operations) requires officers to activate lights and sirens only during verified emergencies and to drive with due regard for public safety. Unauthorized or unsafe driving without proper signals violates this policy.

The DPA could not conclusively identify the officer involved or verify the alleged incident due to a lack of corroborating evidence. The fact that the district station lieutenant was on duty at the time of the alleged complaint is not enough to identify them more likely than not as the officer described by the complainant. 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: 07/27/2025      COMPLETION DATE: 11/25/2025      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 alleged that she called the police regarding recurring threats to her life from tenants in her building. The complainant believed that the tenants had been following her for multiple years and locations. However, the named officers did not take her allegation seriously and did not follow up with her after leaving the scene.

The evidence, such as the Computer Aided Dispatch (CAD) report, officers' body-worn camera footage (BWC), and officer statements, showed that the complainant called the police regarding threats by neighbors who allegedly conspired against her. The CAD also documented suspected mental health issues based on previous calls for services from the complainant.

The named officers spoke with the building manager and the complainant. The complainant informed them that she heard voices through the walls making various threats to her well-being. She believed that the voices were the tenants nearby but could not provide names or specific details. The officers stated that the building manager informed them the rooms adjacent to hers were vacant. The complainant requested to admit herself to the hospital for a mental health evaluation. The officers aided her in doing so and left the scene.

The officers denied the allegation, stating that they investigated the incident properly and took her allegations seriously. However, the complainant did not provide them with evidence of a crime and mental health seemed to play a primary role in her concerns. The named officers summoned an ambulance to assist with transport to the hospital. The named officers confirmed that they did not follow up with the complainant after the preliminary investigation because a crime had not occurred and they considered the incident resolved when the complainant was transported for an evaluation.

The evidence showed that the officers behaved appropriately and professionally throughout the call for service and that follow-up by the named officers was not merited.

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

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

**COMPLAINT DATE: 07/28/25      COMPLETION DATE: 11/06/25      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: 08/08/2025**

**COMPLETION DATE: 11/25/2025**

**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 when he was handcuffed for an outstanding warrant, he had a gray backpack with \$300-\$400 dollars, his important documents such as his passport, copies of identification, driver's license, and previous arrest paperwork. The complainant stated the backpack was left in his apartment building's 5th floor hallway near the elevator where he was handcuffed.

DGO 6.15 Property Processing requires officers receiving and taking property to be responsible for it and book it as evidence or for safekeeping.

The named officers stated they were not required to receive the complainant's backpack and book it as property for safekeeping. Initially the complainant did say he wanted his backpack and then said he needed his papers which were no longer in the backpack at the time. The officers believed the complainant just wanted his papers because that was the last comment he made regarding his property.

The property manager stated she had no knowledge of the complainant's backpack and stated that the complainant never mentioned anything to her about his belongings or backpack regarding the date of the incident. The property manager stated that his items that were strewn about the hallway were left as is and not touched by the management.

The body-worn camera footage corroborated the officers' account that complainant first asked for his backpack and then asked about his papers. The footage showed that the complainant's backpack remained in the hallway along with other property he had in the hallway. The footage showed that numerous fire department personnel were also present.

The officers did not receive or take the backpack as property therefore they were not responsible for it nor required to process for identification.

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: 08/08/2025**

**COMPLETION DATE: 11/25/2025**

**PAGE# 2 of 2**

**SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #3:** The officer seized property or money without justification

**CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: UA**

**FINDING: U**

**FINDINGS OF FACT:** The complainant stated that after he bailed out and came to the apartment his backpack was not there and not in the fifth-floor hallway. He believed an officer saw how much cash he had inside the backpack and took his belongings.

The officers stated the complainant never mentioned money in his backpack and did not take his backpack. One officer stated that the complainant had money on his person that was booked.

Department records showed the complainant's backpack was not booked as evidence, nor for safekeeping. Records showed the complainant had \$220.71 at the time of arrest. He was issued a property receipt from SFPD. The complainant was booked into county jail, and the jail documented \$220.71 in complainant's property. Those records also documented that the currency was released to him when he was released from jail.

The body-worn camera footage did not corroborate complainant's suspicion that an officer took his money as the footage captures the backpack being left at the spot the complainant left it.

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

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

**COMPLAINT DATE: 08/06/25**

**COMPLETION DATE: 11/13/25**

**PAGE# 1 of 1**

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

**CATEGORY OF CONDUCT:**

**FINDING: IO-1/CAO**

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

City Attorney's Office  
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place  
San Francisco, CA 94102

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

**COMPLAINT DATE: 08/13/2025**

**COMPLETION DATE: 11/18/25**

**PAGE# 1 of 3**

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

**CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: ND**

**FINDING: PC**

**FINDINGS OF FACT:** The complainant reported that the named officer spoke from the bottom of the stairs and did not physically move a man from her property.

The named officer stated that while conducting passing calls, he was flagged down by the complainant, who reported a man sleeping on her doorstep. The complainant appeared upset about the lack of response to earlier 311 calls. The named officer apologized and explained that he had just begun his shift. Upon arrival, he observed the man sitting on the stairs, visibly intoxicated and initially refusing to move. He requested backup from another officer. The intoxicated subject later stated he wanted to go to the hospital, at which point the named officer summoned an ambulance. Paramedics arrived and transported the subject without incident. The named officer stated he remained professional and respectful during the encounter. He separated the parties to ensure the complainant's safety and advised her to stay back when she began yelling at the subject. After the subject was transported, he suggested that she return inside to calm the situation. He explained he classified the matter as a medical issue rather than a criminal one, as the subject was intoxicated and unable to care for himself, but had not committed any crime. The complainant only wanted the man removed from her property, which was accomplished when the subject was transported to the hospital.

Body-worn camera footage showed that when the named officer arrived, the complainant appeared extremely frustrated because the intoxicated man had been on her property for several hours after she had called 311 earlier that day. The footage showed the man sitting on the steps, visibly intoxicated, unsteady, incoherent, and verbally aggressive. The named officer repeatedly attempted to persuade the man to leave and offered him options: leave voluntarily, go to the hospital, or be taken to the sobering center. The man eventually agreed to go to the hospital when paramedics arrived. The video also showed that the man had vomited on his clothing, admitted to drinking heavily, and was disoriented. Throughout the encounter, the named officer maintained a calm, professional tone while focusing on resolving the situation safely.

Department General Order (DGO) 1.03 (Duties of Officers) requires officers to respond promptly and appropriately to calls for service. DGO 5.03 (Emergency Assistance) directs officers to seek medical care for individuals who are intoxicated or unable to care for themselves.



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

**COMPLAINT DATE: 08/13/2025**

**COMPLETION DATE: 11/18/25**

**PAGE# 2 of 3**

Computer-Aided Dispatch (CAD) records confirm that the first call for this incident was recorded as a trespassing complaint. Updates showed the complainant was irate due to the earlier lack of response and wanted the subject removed. The event was reclassified as a medical issue when the subject was determined to be intoxicated and nonviolent.

The officer's actions were appropriate under the circumstances. He correctly treated the situation as a medical issue rather than a criminal one, and the complainant's request to have the individual removed was fulfilled. Therefore, while the alleged conduct occurred, the evidence shows that the officer's actions were justified, lawful, and proper.

**SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #2:** The officer behaved or spoke in a manner unbecoming an officer.

**CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: CUO**

**FINDING: U**

**FINDINGS OF FACT:** The complainant stated that while waiting several hours for assistance, a responding officer eventually arrived but acted rudely and dismissively toward her while treating her white male partner with greater respect.

The named officer reported maintaining a professional and courteous demeanor throughout the encounter. He apologized for the delayed police response and advised the complainant to call 911 instead of 311 in future emergencies. He stated that neither he nor his partner acted rudely or dismissively toward the complainant. According to the named officer, when the complainant began yelling at an intoxicated individual, his partner asked her to go inside to prevent the situation from escalating. He emphasized that both officers remained professional, separated the individuals involved, and treated everyone with respect and fairness.

Body-worn camera footage showed that the named officer arrived as backup, acknowledged the complainant's frustration, and apologized for her negative experience with the earlier 311 call. The complainant, still upset, said the situation felt "literally torturing" and that she did not feel safe in her home. The complainant's partner remained calm and spoke briefly to de-escalate the situation, though the complainant interrupted him several times. At one point, the named officer's partner informally addressed

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

**COMPLAINT DATE: 08/13/2025**

**COMPLETION DATE: 11/18/25**

**PAGE# 3 of 3**

the complainant's partner as "boss," which appeared to be a conversational tactic to reduce tension rather than a sign of favoritism.

DGO 2.01 (General Conduct) requires officers to treat all community members with courtesy and respect.

The evidence indicates that the responding officers acted professionally, remained composed, and reacted appropriately to a complex, emotionally charged situation. While the complainant's frustration about response delays was understandable, there is no credible evidence that either officer acted in a rude, dismissive, or biased manner. The response and resolution were consistent with SFPD protocols and expectations for professional conduct. The evidence proves that the conduct alleged did not occur or that the accused officer was not involved.

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

**COMPLAINT DATE: 08/13/2025      COMPLETION DATE: 11/13/25      PAGE# 1 of 3**

**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 continues to target the complainant, an RV resident, unfairly, and cites him for parking violations without ticketing other oversize vehicles on the street for the same violation.

The named officer confirmed familiarity with the complainant, who lives in an RV that has generated numerous community complaints about noise, dogs, and personal belongings on the sidewalks. The named officer could not recall his first interaction with the complainant due to the frequency and duration of calls in the district area. The named officer stated that he has never cited the complainant for lodging but has cited the complainant's truck for expired registration violations. The officer explained that his citations are always based on valid law and not on selective enforcement, and that his contacts with the complainant occur only in response to service calls or during patrols. Regarding the current complaint, the named officer reported that the RV violated multiple codes, including failure to move the vehicle within 72 hours (Traffic Code sec. 7.2.29) and expired registration (CVC sec. 4000(a)(1)). A Park Ranger (not the named officer) issued the citation.

Computer-Aided Dispatch (CAD) records show that the named officer was dispatched to the complainant's trailer after a caller reported it was parked on a public street, with a tent, refrigerator, and bed placed adjacent to the vehicle.

San Francisco Police Department's Department Bulletin 24-126 directs officers to assess the totality of circumstances before issuing citations or initiating towing in cases involving individuals living in vehicles. These directives emphasize professionalism, equal treatment, and the use of discretion when addressing community complaints involving unhoused individuals.

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: 08/13/2025      COMPLETION DATE: 11/13/25      PAGE# 2 of 3**

**SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #2:** The officer's discourteous behavior or statements were related to disability.

**CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: CUO**

**FINDING: U**

**FINDINGS OF FACT:** The officer made inappropriate comments about the RV resident's disability status and relationship status.

The named officer denied making inappropriate comments about the complainant to his girlfriend. The officer described his conduct as professional, respectful, and compassionate. The officer also emphasized that he activates his camera during all interactions.

Body-worn camera footage captured the incident and does not support the complainant's allegation.

Therefore, the evidence establishes that the alleged conduct did not occur.

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

**COMPLAINT DATE: 08/13/2025      COMPLETION DATE: 11/13/25      PAGE# 3 of 3**

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

**CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: CUO**

**FINDING: PC**

**FINDINGS OF FACT:** The officer questioned whether the complainant had a mental illness or disability, citing the repeated need to respond to calls about the complainant's RV and instructing him to relocate it.

The named officer acknowledged speaking with the complainant's partner, referencing ongoing community calls and compliance requirements. The named officer acknowledged making a comment referencing the complainant's possible mental health concerns but denied any mocking or discriminatory intent, explaining it was meant to clarify the department's duty to respond to citizen complaints rather than to target the complainant personally.

Department General Order 2.01, which covers public courtesy, requires officers to treat all individuals with courtesy and respect, avoid discourteous, disrespectful, or discriminatory remarks, and maintain professional conduct in all interactions with the public.

After reviewing the circumstances and the officer's repeated interactions with the complainant, it was determined that the officer acted appropriately and in accordance with department policy. While the complainant may have perceived the officer's comments as unkind, the conduct does not rise to the level of misconduct.

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

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

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

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

**CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: ND**

**FINDING: NF**

**FINDINGS OF FACT:** The complainant submitted a written complaint that her minor child was assaulted, and that the responding officers failed to investigate it. The complainant did not provide the name of her minor child. The incident report number that the complainant provided could not be located.

Department of Police Accountability (DPA) attempted to contact the complainant on various occasions to request information and consent documents, but she did not respond. DPA also contacted the witness who was listed in the online complaint, and they declined to participate in the investigation as they were not present when the incident occurred. Therefore, there was insufficient information to investigate the complaint.

The complainant failed to come forward. As such, the DPA could not proceed with its investigation.

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

**CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: ND**

**FINDING: NF**

**FINDINGS OF FACT:** The complainant stated that the named officers took the witness's shoe, which he never got back.

The complainant did not come forward with additional information necessary to investigate the complaint. As such, the DPA could not proceed with its investigation.

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

**COMPLAINT DATE: 08/27/2025**

**COMPLETION DATE: 11/18/25**

**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 the named officers did not properly investigate the call for service regarding the complainant's former partner having a gun and making threats towards him.

Body-worn camera footage showed that officers arrived promptly and took action. The video captured the reporting party standing against a wall while a woman tried to speak with him. Another person told her to “back up and move.” An officer asked the woman to step aside for a private conversation, and she complied. He requested consent to search her backpack, and she agreed. Both officers asked whether she had a gun. She denied it and said the reporting party often called the police on her without cause. The officers neither saw nor found a firearm, though she said she had a hammer. The officers advised her to leave the area and avoid further conflict. She expressed frustration about having to walk around the block to reach her bus stop but ultimately agreed to leave without incident.

Computer-Aided Dispatch (CAD) described a report of an ex-partner following and harassing the complainant, escalating to a claim that she was gesturing as if she had a gun in her backpack (though no weapon was seen), prompting officers to respond, investigate, and ultimately handle and clear the call.

Under Department General Order (DGO) 5.03 (Investigative Detentions), officers must have reasonable suspicion, based on specific, articulable facts, before detaining an individual. The policy also requires officers to manage potentially volatile situations with appropriate concern for safety, adherence to lawful authority, and protection of everyone involved.

The responding officers acted in accordance with DGO 5.03 by investigating the reported threat, confirming that the former partner did not possess a firearm, separating the parties, and obtaining statements from both parties. The woman’s account contradicted the complainant’s, and officers verified that her stated destination matched the bus route she intended to use. They appropriately advised her to use a different bus stop to avoid further contact. Because they observed no crime and none was articulated, the officers lawfully concluded the contact and allowed her to leave. 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: 08/27/2025      COMPLETION DATE: 11/18/25      PAGE# 2 of 2**

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

**CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: ND**

**FINDING: NF**

**FINDINGS OF FACT:** The officer was fully aware of the complainant's history with their ex-girlfriend; he made no effort to investigate. Instead, he allowed the two responding officers to release her without any inquiry or accountability.

Despite having prior contact with the officer, the complainant could not identify a specific officer. Therefore, there was insufficient information to investigate the complaint.

Body-worn camera footage did not capture any officers at the scene aside from the named officers.

The CAD showed that another officer was dispatched to the scene; however, they were preemptively sent to another call, so they were not on scene.

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

**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: 08/28/2025**

**COMPLETION DATE: 11/25/2025**

**PAGE# 1 of 1**

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

**CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: CUO**

**FINDING: NF**

**FINDINGS OF FACT:** The complainant alleged that during a telephone conversation, the named officer refused to reassign her case to another investigator. The officer commented that he did not like the current investigator, raised his voice, and was aggressive toward the complainant.

Department records confirm that the named officer recently retired from the Department.

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

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

**COMPLAINT DATE: 08/29/2025      COMPLETION DATE: 11/25/2025      PAGE# 1 of 1**

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

**CATEGORY OF CONDUCT:** UA

**FINDING:** PC

**FINDINGS OF FACT:** The complainant stated the named officer did an improper search and seizure of her son when an officer took his DNA swab without her consent. (She later became aware from her son's probation officer that there was a search warrant for the DNA but still feels it was improperly collected without her permission.)

DGO 5.16, Search Warrants, requires officers to comply with all constitutional and statutory requirements when obtaining, executing, and returning search warrants.

Department records showed the named officer obtained a search warrant, properly executed the search warrant, and filed the search warrant.

Per the investigation, the evidence showed that the named officer did not need the complainant's permission to obtain a DNA swab from her son under these particular circumstances and the officer complied with Department policy.

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

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

**COMPLAINT DATE: 09/07/2025      COMPLETION DATE: 11/7/25      PAGE# 1 of 1**

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

**CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: PP**

**FINDING: PC**

**FINDINGS OF FACT:** The complainant stated that the victim provided one description of a suspect, but a later bulletin circulated a significantly different version that matched details from a different case. That changed description was then used to suggest a pattern of behavior that was never proven in court. At sentencing, the judge even referenced an uncharged incident as a factor in deciding a life sentence, despite no conviction ever being obtained for that event.

The evidence and case materials provided to another law enforcement jurisdiction were acted upon within the scope of their lawful authority and departmental policy. The department's actions were consistent with accepted practices for interjurisdictional assistance and were conducted in good faith to support an active investigation.

**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 Mateo County District Attorney's Office – Main Office  
500 County Center  
3rd Floor  
Redwood City, CA 94063

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

**COMPLAINT DATE: 09/11/2025      COMPLETION DATE: 11/25/2025      PAGE# 1 of 3**

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

**CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: ND**

**FINDING: PC**

**FINDINGS OF FACT:** The complainant lodged a complaint against the named officers alleging that they refused to review evidence and failed to properly investigate a call for service regarding a problematic tenant inside the shared residence where she lived.

The evidence, such as the Computer Aided Dispatch (CAD) report, the officers' body-worn camera footage, and the complainant's statements showed the following: the subject tenant had moved into the shared residence a few days prior to the call for service generated by the complainant. The complainant alleged that the tenant had not paid rent and that the landlord told the complainant to call the police on her behalf. The named officers responded to the residence and investigated the incident. The named officers spoke with both the complainant and other tenants within the residence who shed light on the complainant's credibility and informed the officers that the rent was not overdue. The officers informed the complainant that they did not have jurisdiction or the authority to do anything regarding the alleged non-payment of rent and that it was a civil matter. The complainant appeared frustrated and confused at the officers' decisions and offered additional information to attempt to have the officers arrest or speak with the other subject tenant. However, upon further questioning, the officers determined that no crime had occurred.

The officers informed the complainant of the available options moving forward and that if criminal activity arose in the future, she could call the police. Additionally, if the landlord needed police assistance, the landlord should contact the police herself. The officers left the scene.

The evidence showed that the officers investigated the incident properly, did not fail to review pertinent evidence, and were correct in their assertions that there was nothing further they could do as the matter was civil in nature and a crime had not occurred.

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

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

**COMPLAINT DATE: 09/11/2025      COMPLETION DATE: 11/25/2025      PAGE# 2 of 3**

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

**CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: ND**

**FINDING: PC**

**FINDINGS OF FACT:** The above facts are hereby incorporated by reference. The complainant also complained that the officers failed to generate an incident report.

The evidence showed that the officers had in fact refused to generate a report about the occurrence as a crime had not occurred. The officers explained this to the complainant and advised her of her available options moving forward.

Department policy did not require the named officers to generate a report in this circumstance as a crime had not occurred, and the over-due rent issue was civil in nature.

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: 09/11/2025      COMPLETION DATE: 11/25/2025      PAGE# 3 of 3**

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

**CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: CUO**

**FINDING: U**

**FINDINGS OF FACT:** The above facts are hereby incorporated by reference. The complainant also alleged that the named officers engaged in inappropriate behavior by making fun of her, forced her to speak with them in front of the other tenants, and was rude to a friend of hers who later called the police to conduct a well-being check on the complainant.

The evidence, such as the named officers' body-worn camera footage, did not show the officers were rude or made fun of the complainant in any way. While the officers spoke with the complainant in the hallway of the shared residence, the officers did not force her to speak with them there, nor did she inform the officers that speaking in the hallway made her uncomfortable. Additionally, despite running several queries, DPA could not locate evidence of the alleged call for service generated by the complainant's friend as mentioned above. The officers remained professional and courteous throughout the incident.

The evidence proves that the conduct alleged did not occur.

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

**COMPLAINT DATE: 09/12/2025**

**COMPLETION DATE: 11/06/2025**

**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 lives on a street where there is an on-going issue with unhoused individuals blocking the street, using and dealing drugs. He stated that he has called the non-emergency number many times and no one shows up or if they do, they only move along the people.

The named officers did not have a specific recollection of the incident but were familiar with the area and have responded to quality-of-life issues and calls for service and were also familiar as to when to contact the Homeless Engagement Assistance Team for assistance.

DGO 2.01 Rule 5, Performing Duties, requires officers to perform their duties promptly and according to department policies and procedures.

Department records showed that the named officers responded to the call and advised individuals in the area.

The evidence showed the officers responded to the call as required to do so and, in this case, they advised the individuals in the area. Unless the officers observe unlawful behavior when they arrive, these actions are within Department policy.

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

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

**COMPLAINT DATE: 09/15/2025**

**COMPLETION DATE: 11/7/25**

**PAGE# 1 of 1**

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

**CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: UA**

**FINDING: NF**

**FINDINGS OF FACT:** The complainant reported that while waiting for a parking space, a patrol vehicle stopped behind their car. The complainant's partner, who is a disabled passenger, was in the vehicle at the time. The complainant drove around a double-parked car when the patrol vehicle was pulling up behind them. The complainant later received a citation by mail and expressed concern about the lack of communication and courtesy.

The DPA contacted the San Francisco Superior Court's Traffic Division to verify the citation referenced by the complainant. Based on the citation number and information provided, the Traffic Division reported no record of the citation in its system. The complainant also provided a badge number believed to belong to the officer involved. The DPA confirmed through the San Francisco Police Department's personnel records that the officer assigned to that badge number was not on duty on the date and time of the alleged incident.

The DPA made multiple attempts to contact the complainant to clarify details regarding the date, location, and circumstances of the incident, as well as to schedule an interview. The complainant did not respond to these requests. No findings are made if the officer cannot reasonably be identified or the officer has left the Department and is therefore no longer subject to discipline.



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

**COMPLAINT DATE: 09/15/2025**

**COMPLETION DATE: 11/04/25**

**PAGE# 1 of 1**

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

**CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: UA**

**FINDING: PC**

**FINDINGS OF FACT:** The complainant stated that the named officers used deception to get him to leave his apartment before arresting him.

The evidence, including records and body-worn camera footage, showed that the complainant had an outstanding arrest warrant from another jurisdiction. The officers discovered the warrant a week prior to the arrest when the complainant reported an unrelated crime. During the initial contact, officers advised the complainant to resolve his outstanding arrest warrant, which was active. One week later, the officers returned to complainant's apartment. They asked him come outside his apartment to discuss the case the case from the week prior. The complainant agreed and left his apartment. The officers arrested the complainant in the hallway outside of his apartment. The officers explained that he was being arrested because of the arrest warrant and that he would be transferred to another county.

Officers may use deceptive tactics to induce individuals to induce their homes, so long as the deception is not coercive. The complainant was aware that he was dealing with police officers, the officers had previously informed him of his arrest warrant, and video showed that the complainant voluntarily agreed to leave his apartment to discuss a different case. The evidence showed that the named officers did use deception to bring the complainant out of his apartment, however the nature of the deception did not violate policy.

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

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

**COMPLAINT DATE: 09/15/2025**

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

**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 called emergency services to request an involuntary mental health detention for another party. The complainant stated that the responding officer tried to enter an area where he was not allowed and had to be stopped by staff. The complainant also stated that the named officer told staff that they were wasting his time.

Documentary and video evidence showed that officer stood outside the front door and waited for staff to bring their client to the front door. When the client was brought to the front area, the named officer took a step towards the client so that he could engage the client in conversation. There was no attempt by the named officer to enter any other area of the building. The body camera footage also showed that the named officer told the staff that they had called police before and should know the process. The named officer explained that policy was for him to transport their client which would free up any ambulance to deal with more important medical situations. At no point did the named officer tell the staff that they were wasting his time.

The named officer acted professionally throughout and explained to both the staff members and the client why he was there and the reason he was taking the actions that he did.

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

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

**CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: UA**

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

**COMPLAINT DATE: 09/15/2025**

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

**PAGE# 2 of 2**

**FINDING: PC**

**FINDINGS OF FACT:** The complainant stated that the named officer unnecessarily handcuffed her client.

SFPD documents stated that the named officer detained and transported the complainant's client.

Body camera footage showed that the named officer handcuffed the complainant's client. The footage also showed that the named officer explained to the complainant that it was policy for him to handcuff the client for transportation.

SFPD DGO 5.21 states: Detention/Transport: When detaining an individual for a psychiatric evaluation and no criminal charges are pending, officers shall, when feasible, explain to the person in crisis they are not under arrest, but only being transported to a medical or mental health facility for evaluation. Officer should also explain that it is necessary to search and temporarily handcuff them for their safety while being transported to the facility.

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: 09/16/2025      COMPLETION DATE: 11/06/25      PAGE# 1 of 1**

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

**CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: UA**

**FINDING: PC**

**FINDINGS OF FACT:** The complainant stated in an online complaint that two officers showed up to take a report and “duped [him] into accepting a ‘911’ report instead of a criminal field report.” With his complaint the complainant provided a photo of the follow-up form showing the officers’ names as well as a short video clip of an individual standing in front of his car and blocking its way. The Department of Police Accountability (DPA) made multiple attempts to contact the complainant, but he did not respond to these overtures. Accordingly, DPA does not have further details regarding the complainant’s concerns.

The computer aided dispatch (CAD) report showed that the named officers responded to a call for service for a fight without a weapon. It was noted that another individual got upset regarding the car the complainant was driving and stopped the complainant’s car in the middle of traffic, calling the complainant a terrible person and fascist. The report reflected that the complainant wanted to meet with officers regarding this “politically charged incident.” The named officers arrived, noting that the other party was gone on arrival, and closed out the call indicating that there was no merit to a crime.

Body-worn camera (BWC) footage showed that the named officers met with the complainant. The other party was no longer at the scene. They asked the complainant whether he had any injuries or whether anything had been damaged and the complainant replied, no. The named officers expressed sympathy for his experience and provided the complainant with a CAD number and follow-up form. At no time did the BWC show the named officers “duping” the complainant in any fashion.

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: 09/17/2025      COMPLETION DATE: 11/13/25      PAGE# 1 of 2**

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

**CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: CUO**

**FINDING: U**

**FINDINGS OF FACT:** The complainant filed a complaint stating that he was going home and saw four officers in front of his residence talking to a homeless person. The complainant stated that the female officer was blocking the entrance, so he said, "Excuse me." The officer looked at him, rolled her eyes, and did not move. She also questioned if he lived there. The complainant used a profanity toward the officer. The complainant alleged that the officer was rude to him for no reason and projected her negative energy towards him.

There were no Department records that captured this interaction.

Body-worn camera footage captured the named officer detaining a squatter next to the entrance of an apartment building. The complainant then approached the named officer from the left. He said, "Excuse me," as he walked nonchalantly towards the officer, waving a paper in his hand to signal the officer to move away. The officer stepped aside, allowing the complainant to pass. However, the complainant still yelled, "move!" and "damn, bitch" at the officer. From the footage, the officer did not ask if the complainant lived there. But other officers on scene told the complainant not to call the officer a "bitch." The footage did not capture the officer rolling her eyes.

The evidence we collected proves that the complainant walked directly towards an area with active police activity. The officer moved away as he wanted; however, she was still called a "bitch" and yelled at. The evidence shows that the officer did not exhibit any rudeness. The evidence proves that the conduct alleged did not occur.

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

**CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: UF**

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

**COMPLAINT DATE: 09/17/2025      COMPLETION DATE: 11/13/25      PAGE# 2 of 2**

**FINDING: U**

**FINDINGS OF FACT:** The complainant added to his complaint that while he was passing through, the officer pushed his left shoulder with her right shoulder. He said he has medical issues and that he could have lost balance. The complainant did not provide any medical records.

There were no Department records that captured this interaction.

Body-worn camera footage captured that the complainant chose to walk through the narrow space behind the female officer to the apartment entrance after the officer stepped away to make space for him. The footage did not capture that the named officer pushed the complainant with her shoulder. The complainant did not lose his balance but continued to justify calling the officer a “bitch”.

The evidence collected proves that the officer did not push the complainant or use any force on him. It proves that the conduct alleged did not occur.

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

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

**COMPLETION DATE: 11/18/2025**

**PAGE# 1 of 1**

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

**CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: UA**

**FINDING: U**

**FINDINGS OF FACT:** The complainant believed that the named officer and the property manager where she resided colluded and engaged in illegal activity against her. The complainant specifically complained of an occurrence where she alleged that the named officer unlawfully kicked down her door and entered her residence without a warrant while her minor children were present.

The evidence, such as police records and body-worn camera footage, did not support the complainant's assertions. The evidence showed that the named officers responded to a call for service generated by the building manager as the building manager needed access to the complainant's unit for maintenance inspection. The named officer attempted to aid the building manager in gaining access to her unit by knocking on the door and speaking to the complainant. The named officer's attempts were unsuccessful as the complainant refused to open the door and screamed profanities at the officers. The officers informed the building manager they could not do anything further and left the scene.

The officers did not kick down the door or enter the unit at any time. The evidence also does not support the fact that the named officer was working with the building manager to do anything nefarious.

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

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

**COMPLAINT DATE: 09/27/2025**

**COMPLETION DATE: 11/13/25**

**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 expressed concern about being denied visitation with her boyfriend while he was hospitalized. She stated that she was informed no visitors were allowed because her boyfriend was in custody.

The Department of Police Accountability (DPA) attempted to contact the complainant for additional information, but those efforts were unsuccessful.

Due to the limited information available, the DPA was unable to conduct a formal investigation.

In general, when an adult in custody is hospitalized in San Francisco, visitation is not guaranteed and is subject to different procedures than in-jail visits. The San Francisco Sheriff's Department determines visitation based on the specific hospital ward, the patient's medical condition, and security considerations. The process typically requires pre-approval and may restrict visitation to certain individuals and time frames.

No findings are made if an involved officer cannot reasonably be identified.



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

**COMPLAINT DATE: 09/27/2025**

**COMPLETION DATE: 11/04/25**

**PAGE# 1 of 1**

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

**CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: IO/1**

**FINDING: Referral/CHP**

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

California Highway Patrol Office of Investigations  
601 North 7th Street  
PO Box 942898  
Sacramento, CA 94298

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

**COMPLAINT DATE: 09/30/2025**

**COMPLETION DATE: 11/06/2025**

**PAGE# 1 of 2**

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

**CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: CUO**

**FINDING: PC**

**FINDINGS OF FACT:** The complainant stated she called the station several times regarding a standby for her contractor and after being informed by the non-emergency Dispatch that her number was blocked by the station. She blocked her caller ID and was finally able to speak to the named sergeant. The complainant said the sergeant was rude and asked her if she was drunk or on drugs because she spoke too slow.

DGO 2.01, Rule 1, Misconduct, in part states that officers must conduct themselves in a professional manner.

The named officer stated that the complainant had very soft and slow speech. Based on his training and experience, he suspected that she might be under the influence of alcohol or drugs. As she struggled to stay on topic and spoke slowly, he inquired whether she had used any alcohol or drugs that day. However, she denied having consumed either. The named officer was trying to determine whether she was experiencing mental illness, substance use issues, or a combination of both. His goal was to understand the root of the problem, identify the type of police assistance she needed to help her stay focused, and address what was causing her to meander in her conversation.

During her DPA interview, the complainant displayed slow speech, suggesting she might be under the influence of substances. Department records indicate that she has experienced several incidents related to a decline in mental health. However, these incidents did not meet the criteria for a 5150 hold.

Although the named officer asked the complainant about her possible intoxication or drug use, these questions do not constitute misconduct, as the officer attempted to assess the type of police assistance she required.

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: 09/30/2025**

**COMPLETION DATE: 11/06/2025**

**PAGE# 2 of 2**

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

**CATEGORY OF CONDUCT:**

**FINDING: IO-1/IAD**

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

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

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

**COMPLAINT DATE: 09/29/25      COMPLETION DATE: 11//06/2025      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 was staying at a shelter house when she had an altercation with a staff member. Using a video relay, the complainant called 911 for police assistance. The complainant stated the responding officers failed to take her statement.

The Department of Police Accountability (DPA) obtained the body-worn camera footage associated with the incident. The footage shows that the officers conducted a thorough interview with the program manager. When they inquired about speaking with the complainant, they were informed that she had already left and was not in her room.

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

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

**CATEGORY OF CONDUCT:**

**FINDING: IO-1/FKHS**

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

**COMPLAINT DATE: 09/29/25**

**COMPLETION DATE: 11//06/2025**

**PAGE# 1 of 2**

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

Five Keys Housing Services  
320 13<sup>th</sup> Street  
Oakland, CA 94612

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

**CATEGORY OF CONDUCT:**

**FINDING: IO-1/DEM**

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

DEM Division of Emergency Communications  
1011 Turk Street  
San Francisco  
CA 94102

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

**COMPLAINT DATE: 10/04/2025**

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

**PAGE# 1 of 1**

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

**CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: ND**

**FINDING: NF**

**FINDINGS OF FACT:** The complainant stated he wanted to file a missing person report and was denied.

DPA was unable to independently identify the officers based solely on information provided in the online complaint. The complainant did not respond to multiple requests for additional information. DPA sent an identification poll to the district station asking for assistance identifying officers based on a description of the incident. No officers were identified through the poll. Therefore, there was insufficient information to investigate the complaint.

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

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

**CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: ND**

**FINDING: NF**

**FINDINGS OF FACT:** The complainant stated that “someone” chased him, prompting him to run towards some officers nearby. The complainant stated he was ignored.

DPA was unable to independently identify the officers based solely on information provided in the online complaint. The complainant did not respond to multiple requests for additional information. DPA sent an identification poll to the district station asking for assistance identifying officers based on a description of the incident. No officers were identified through the poll. Therefore, there was insufficient information to investigate the complaint. A no finding outcome occurs when DPA cannot complete an investigation because the officers cannot reasonably be identified.

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

**COMPLAINT DATE: 10/08/2025      COMPLETION DATE: 11/25/25      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 the officer was “rude and unprofessional,” stating to the complainant and his wife, “There is enough space. If you can’t move your car in that space, you shouldn’t be driving in this country.”

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

Department records did not show any security footage that captured the incident.

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

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

**COMPLAINT DATE: 10/12/2025      COMPLETION DATE: 11/25/2025      PAGE# 1 of 1**

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

**CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: ND**

**FINDING: NF**

**FINDINGS OF FACT:** The complainant stated that the officer used emergency lights to make an illegal left turn to go back to the station.

Since the complainant could not identify the specific officers involved in the interaction, DPA sent an ID Poll to the 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.



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

**COMPLAINT DATE: 10/13/2025      COMPLETION DATE: 11/06/2025      PAGE# 1 of 1**

**SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #1:** The officer improperly or unsafely used Department or City Equipment.

**CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: ND**

**FINDING: PC**

**FINDINGS OF FACT:** An anonymous complainant reported online that officers were excessively using their squad car sirens and buzzers for about half an hour. The complainant stated that they could hear the sirens and buzzers from several blocks away, which they believed were being used to move people. They suggested that if the officers were trying to disperse crowds, they should at least leave their squad cars instead of disturbing the entire neighborhood. The complainant criticized the officers for appearing lazy and opting to stay in their vehicles rather than managing the situation like a normal officer would, ultimately waking up the whole neighborhood in the process.

DGO 5.05, Emergency Response and Pursuit Driving, requires officers to respond to emergency calls expeditiously. Additionally, when responding to emergency calls officers are required to use lights and sirens.

Department of Emergency Management records showed several units responding to emergency calls near the incident location and around the time the incident occurred.

Officers are permitted by Department Policy and the Vehicle Code to use their sirens, air horns, and microphones as warnings when responding to emergencies. There is no evidence to support the complainant's belief that officers were using buzzers and sirens as a crowd control method to clear people off the street.

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

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

**COMPLAINT DATE: 10/28/2025      COMPLETION DATE: 11/04/2025      PAGE# 1 of 1**

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

**CATEGORY OF CONDUCT:**

**FINDING: IO-1/SFO**

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

San Francisco International Airport  
Attn: Ground Transportation  
PO Box 8097  
San Francisco, CA 94128-8097

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

**COMPLAINT DATE: 10/14/2025**

**COMPLETION DATE: 11/13/2025**

**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 was a street vendor. She stated that she tried to put her food away but was not completely done when a city inspector came and pushed her and cart, causing her to fall. The police were around but did not do anything to the city employee that pushed her. The complainant said she was in pain and injured and was told she needed to see the doctor but did not recall if they asked whether she needed an ambulance.

DGO 2.01 Rule 5. Performing Duties requires officers to perform their duties promptly and according to Department policies and procedures.

Department records documented that the named officers were assigned to assist a city agency that was tasked to clear the streets to be pressure-washed and repainted. The records also documented that the named officers used language line to communicate with the complainant and that she was offered medical treatment, but she refused.

Body-worn camera footage corroborated the incident report and showed that the complainant was not pushed by the city employee. He was standing beside the complainant, and both were holding onto her cart. As the complainant tried to walk away with cart, they both tripped and fell.

The evidence showed that the named officers performed their duties as required and that there was no enforcement action required against the city employee.

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: 10/16/2025**

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

**PAGE# 1 of 1**

**SUMMARY OF ALLEGATIONS #1-2:** The officers failed to handle an assigned radio call.

**CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: ND**

**FINDING: U**

**FINDINGS OF FACT:** An anonymous complainant stated that the police were called twice regarding a fight in an apartment, and that police never showed up.

Dispatch records showed that officers were sent to the residence for the calls. Records showed the officers informed dispatch that they were unable to gain entry to the building and that they had called and left a message with the reporting party.

Body-worn camera footage for the incident showed that officers responded to the residence, and they were unable to gain entry to the building as an exterior gate was locked. The officers used the intercom system at the residence to call the reporting party back; the call was routed to the caller's phone, but there was no answer, so the officer left a voice message.

The evidence proves that the conduct alleged did not occur.

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

**COMPLAINT DATE: 10/15/2025      COMPLETION DATE: 11/18/2025      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: 10/21/2025**

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

**PAGE# 1 of 1**

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

**CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: ND**

**FINDING: NF**

**FINDINGS OF FACT:** The complainant stated he wanted to file a missing person report and was denied.

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

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

**SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #2:** The officer failed to write an incident report.

**CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: ND**

**FINDING: NF**

**FINDINGS OF FACT:** The complainant stated that "someone" chased him, prompting him to run towards some officers nearby. The complainant stated he was ignored.

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

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

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

**COMPLAINT DATE: 10/23/2025**

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

**PAGE# 1 of 3**

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

**CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: UA**

**FINDING: PC**

**FINDINGS OF FACT:** The complainant stated he disagreed with the ticket issued by the named officer.

Department records show that the named officer cited the complainant for violating California Vehicle Code section 23123(a).

Body-worn camera footage showed the named officer conducting a traffic stop on the complainant. The named officer informed the complainant that he was stopped for holding his phone while driving. The complainant admitted this; however, he asked for a warning instead of a citation. The named officer explained that the citation had already been issued and asked the complainant to sign it, emphasizing that signing it was not an admission of guilt. The complainant told the named officer that he wanted to consult an attorney before signing. The named officer asked whether he had any questions and reiterated that signing did not imply guilt. The complainant then spent a long time scrolling on his phone. The named officer provided the complainant with the relevant Vehicle Code section and waited patiently while the complainant made a phone call. At no point did the officer instruct the complainant to get off his phone. Eventually, the complainant agreed to sign the citation, which he did.

California Vehicle Code section 23123(a) states, "A person shall not drive a motor vehicle while using a wireless telephone unless that telephone is specifically designed and configured to allow hands-free listening and talking and is used in that manner while driving."

The named officer did not violate Department policy by issuing the complainant a citation for an infraction, which he freely admitted to.

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

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

**COMPLAINT DATE: 10/23/2025**

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

**PAGE# 2 of 3**

**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 threatened him with arrest if he did not sign the citation.

Department records show that the named officer cited the complainant for violating California Vehicle Code section 23123(a).

Body-worn camera footage showed the named officer informing the complainant that refusal to sign the citation would result in arrest. The officer also permitted the complainant additional time to conduct research on his phone and make a phone call, after which the complainant agreed to sign the citation.

California Vehicle Code section 40500 emphasizes that signing a citation is a promise to appear in court, and not an admission of guilt.

California Vehicle Code section 40508 provides that failing to appear, which includes refusing to sign a citation, can be charged as a misdemeanor, punishable by up to six months in jail.

The named officer exhibited considerable patience by allowing the complainant time to conduct research and make a phone call before signing the citation. He acted in accordance with the law and Department policy by informing the complainant that refusal to sign the citation could result in arrest.

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



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

**COMPLAINT DATE: 10/23/2025      COMPLETION DATE: 11/25/25      PAGE# 3 of 3**

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

**CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: CUO**

**FINDING: PC**

**FINDINGS OF FACT:** The complainant stated the named officer provided him with inaccurate information regarding the consequences of the traffic citation.

Department records show that the named officer cited the complainant for violating California Vehicle Code section 23123(a).

Body-worn camera footage showed the named officer correctly informing the complainant that the citation was for an infraction, which could be contested in court. He explained to the complainant that it was a moving violation and, if found guilty, it would result in a point on his driving record. As an alternative, he explained that if eligible, he could attend traffic school.

Body-worn camera footage showed the named officer explain, in a very professional, accurate, and straightforward manner, the consequences of receiving a moving violation in accordance with the law.

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

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

**COMPLAINT DATE: 10/23/2025**

**COMPLETION DATE: 11/04/25**

**PAGE# 1 of 1**

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

**CATEGORY OF CONDUCT:**

**FINDING: IO-2**

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

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

**COMPLAINT DATE: 10/24/2025      COMPLETION DATE: 11/04/25      PAGE# 1 of 1**

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

**CATEGORY OF CONDUCT:**

**FINDING: IO-2**

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

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

**COMPLAINT DATE: 10/24/2025**

**COMPLETION DATE: 11/04/25**

**PAGE# 1 of 1**

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

**CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: XX**

**FINDING: Referral/UCSF POLICE DEPARTMENT**

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

UCSF Police Department  
654 Minnesota Street  
San Francisco, CA 94143-0238  
Attention: Chief of Police

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

**COMPLAINT DATE: 10/24/2025**

**COMPLETION DATE: 11/07/25**

**PAGE# 1 of 2**

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

**CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: ND**

**FINDING: PC**

**FINDINGS OF FACT:** The complainant stated the named officer did not write a report regarding a property dispute regarding a house. In addition, she indicated her sister threatened to kill her.

The named officer stated that he did not prepare an incident report because he concluded that a crime had not occurred. He noted the dispute over the house was civil in nature, and the threat did not meet the elements required under California Penal Code § 422. He stated the complainant and her sister did not live together, and the sister was alone and unarmed, with no apparent means to inflict great bodily injury. He stated, additionally, that the complainant did not appear to be in immediate or sustained fear and did not demonstrate any fear consistent with a credible threat.

Department records indicate that officers responded to a call for service regarding a verbal property dispute between two sisters. The call for service concluded with officers noting that it was a civil matter and advising both parties to contact an attorney regarding property ownership.

Body-worn camera footage showed the named officer and his partner speaking with both parties, who each claimed ownership of a house. The named officer informed the complainant that the dispute was civil and not a police matter. The complainant then informed the named officer that her sister had threatened to kill her; however, she did not provide any further information. Officers advised the parties once again that the matter was civil and that they could seek a resolution in civil court.

Penal Code § 422 states in relevant part that a threat must be unequivocal, unconditional, immediate, and specific.

Department General Order 2.01 (General Rules of Conduct) states in relevant part, "While on duty, members shall make all required written reports of crimes or incidents requiring police attention."

The named officer did not violate Department policy by failing to write a report. Although the complainant informed officers that her sister had threatened to kill her, she did not provide sufficient detail to meet the elements required under Penal Code § 422 and therefore did not establish criminal

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

**COMPLAINT DATE: 10/24/2025**

**COMPLETION DATE: 11/07/25**

**PAGE# 2 of 2**

conduct. Additionally, the dispute between the complainant and her sister regarding ownership of a residence constitutes a civil matter, not a criminal one.

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

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

**CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: CUO**

**FINDING: IE**

**FINDINGS OF FACT:** The complainant stated she called the police a second time to report the ongoing property dispute she had with her sister. In response, the named officer called her and informed her that the matter was civil in nature. She alleged that the named officer raised his voice during the call and abruptly ended the conversation by hanging up. The complainant further stated that this was the same officer she had interacted with a few days earlier regarding the same issue.

The named officer reported that he spoke with the complainant by phone and informed her that the dispute with her sister was a civil matter, not one for police intervention. He stated he explained this to her multiple times and advised her to pursue the issue through civil court. According to the officer, the complainant refused to listen and began to ramble, prompting him to end the call. He denied raising his voice and asserted that he conducted himself appropriately and in accordance with Department policy.

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

As the interaction with the complainant occurred over the phone, activation of the body-worn camera was not required. Consequently, the evidence fails to prove or disprove that the alleged conduct occurred.

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

**COMPLAINT DATE: 10/24/2025**

**COMPLETION DATE: 11/04/25**

**PAGE# 1 of 1**

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

**CATEGORY OF CONDUCT:**

**FINDING: IO-2**

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

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

**COMPLAINT DATE: 10/25/2025**

**COMPLETION DATE: 11/13/25**

**PAGE# 1 of 1**

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

**CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: CUO**

**FINDING: NF**

**FINDINGS OF FACT:** An anonymous complainant submitted an online complaint stating they called a district police station twice to report a noise issue. On both occasions, they spoke with the same officer and dispatcher but did not obtain their names. Each time, they were told that officers would be dispatched; however, no response occurred.

Because the complainant chose to remain anonymous and declined further contact, the Department of Police Accountability (DPA) was unable to gather additional information.

The DPA reviewed Computer Aided Dispatch (CAD) records and found multiple calls related to noise complaints in the area. According to CAD, officers responded but were unable to locate any individuals at the scene.

To identify the officer involved in the phone calls, the DPA issued an identification poll to the relevant police station. No officer was identified through this process. As a result, there was insufficient information to proceed with a full investigation.

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

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

**CATEGORY OF CONDUCT:**

**FINDING: Partial IO-1Referral/DEM**

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

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



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

**COMPLAINT DATE: 10/25/2025**

**COMPLETION DATE: 11/13/25**

**PAGE# 1 of 1**

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

**CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: ND**

**FINDING: NF**

**FINDINGS OF FACT:** An anonymous complainant submitted an online complaint stating an unoccupied police vehicle was parked in the middle of the street (double-parked) and was blocking all the public transit buses. The complainant provided a photograph of the car showing one bus in the roadway, but it was unclear whether the bus was unable to pass. The picture did not capture the vehicle number, license plate, or the building address where it was parked.

Because the complainant chose to remain anonymous and declined further contact, the Department of Police Accountability (DPA) was unable to gather additional information.

The DPA queried Computer-Aided Dispatch (CAD) records to locate a call for service in the area but found no matches.

To identify the officer involved, the DPA issued an identification poll to the relevant police station. No officer was identified through this process. As a result, there was insufficient information to proceed with a full investigation.

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: 10/28/2025      COMPLETION DATE: 11/13/2025      PAGE# 1 of 1**

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

**CATEGORY OF CONDUCT:**

**FINDING: IO-1/DEM**

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

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

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

**COMPLAINT DATE: 10/28/2025**

**COMPLETION DATE: 11/13/2025**

**PAGE# 1 of 1**

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

**CATEGORY OF CONDUCT:**

**FINDING: IO-1/SOTF**

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

Sunshine Ordinance Task Force  
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 244  
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

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

**COMPLAINT DATE: 10/30/2025**

**COMPLETION DATE: 11/04/25**

**PAGE# 1 of 1**

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

**CATEGORY OF CONDUCT:**

**FINDING: IO-2**

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

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

**COMPLAINT DATE: 11/03/2025**

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

**PAGE# 1 of 2**

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

**CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: ND**

**FINDING: NF**

**FINDINGS OF FACT:** The complainant stated that officers failed to take his report about an online theft.

The complainant provided a name and badge number that do not exist.

Police documents do not show any contact between officers and the complainant within the last year. All previous contact did was about issues not related to the online theft.

An ID poll was sent to the complainant's local station. The poll failed to identify any officer that had any dealing with the complainant about the online theft.

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 behaved or spoke inappropriately.

**CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: CUO**

**FINDING: NF**

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

**COMPLAINT DATE: 11/03/2025**

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

**PAGE# 2 of 2**

**FINDINGS OF FACT:** The complainant stated that an officer laughed at him when he tried to file a report.

The complainant provided a name and badge number that do not exist.

Police documents do not show any contact between officers and the complainant within the last year. All previous contact did was about issues not related to the online theft.

An ID poll was sent to the complainant's local station. The poll failed to identify any officer that had any dealing with the complainant about the online theft.

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

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

**COMPLAINT DATE: 11/02/2025**

**COMPLETION DATE: 11/18/2025**

**PAGE# 1 of 1**

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

**CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: ND**

**FINDING: NF/W**

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

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

**COMPLAINT DATE: 11/06/25**

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

**PAGE# 1 of 1**

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

**CATEGORY OF CONDUCT:**

**FINDING: IO-1/IAD**

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

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



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

**COMPLAINT DATE: 11/07/2025**

**COMPLETION DATE: 11/13/25**

**PAGE# 1 of 1**

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

**CATEGORY OF CONDUCT:**

**FINDING: IO-2**

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

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

**COMPLAINT DATE: 11/07/2025**

**COMPLETION DATE: 11/18/2025**

**PAGE# 1 of 1**

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

**CATEGORY OF CONDUCT:**

**FINDING: IO-1/IAD**

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

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

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

**COMPLAINT DATE: 11/13/2025**

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

**PAGE# 1 of 1**

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

**CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: CUO**

**FINDING: U**

**FINDINGS OF FACT:** The complainant alleged the named officer engaged in intimidation and harassment under the color of law by approaching his residence and questioning him about non-existent interactions with a neighbor. The complainant acknowledged that his neighbor's daughter has a restraining order against him.

Department records indicate that the named officer responded to a call for service involving an alleged violation of a restraining order. The protected party, identified as the daughter of the complainant's neighbor, reported that the complainant, who is the restrained party, violated the order by shouting profanities at her and her mother from his window. The named officer attempted to speak to the complainant, who declined to come outside and instead talked to the officer from his window, denying any interaction with the protected party.

Body-worn camera footage showed the named officer speaking to the protected party, who reported that the complainant yelled profanities at her and her mother from his window as they drove by his house. The named officer then walked to the complainant's house and asked the complainant to come outside. The complainant declined and spoke to the named officer from his second-story window. The complainant denied any interaction with his neighbor or the protected party. The named officer had minimal contact with the complainant and ended it when the complainant refused to come outside.

The named officer acted in accordance with Department policy. Upon receiving a report from the protected party alleging that the complainant had violated a restraining order, the officer was obligated to initiate an investigation, which appropriately included attempting to speak with the complainant. Failure to do so would have been a violation of Department policy. Body-worn camera footage confirmed that the officer remained calm throughout the interaction and did not engage in any behavior that could be construed as intimidating.

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

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

**COMPLAINT DATE: 11/13/2025**

**COMPLETION DATE: 11/18/25**

**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/IAD**

**FINDINGS OF FACT:** This complaint raises matters outside the Department of Police Accountability'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: 11/14/2025      COMPLETION DATE: 11/25/25      PAGE# 1 of 1**

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

**CATEGORY OF CONDUCT:**

**FINDING: IO-2**

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

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

**COMPLAINT DATE: 11/19/25    COMPLETION DATE: 11/25/25    PAGE# 1 of 1**

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

**CATEGORY OF CONDUCT:**

**FINDING: IO-1/IAD**

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

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

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

**COMPLAINT DATE: 11/20/2025      COMPLETION DATE: 11/25/25      PAGE# 1 of 1**

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

**CATEGORY OF CONDUCT:**

**FINDING: IO-2**

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

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

**COMPLAINT DATE: 11/21/2025**

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

**PAGE# 1 of 1**

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

**CATEGORY OF CONDUCT:**

**FINDING: IO-1/CENTRAL STATION**

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

San Francisco Police Department  
Central Station  
766 Vallejo Street  
San Francisco, CA 94133